Class Lit 4744 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning
19 Mr 27

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/musicinchurchwor0000gwau

MUSIC IN CHURCH WORSHIP

BEING THE BAIRD LECTURE FOR 1926

MUSIC IN CHURCH WORSHIP

BEING THE BAIRD LECTURE FOR 1926

BY THE REV.

G. WAUCHOPE STEWART, D.D.

MINISTER OF HADDINGTON

CALVIN COLLEGE LIBRARY GRAND RAPIDS

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LIMITED LONDON

Lit
4744
81685

First Published . . . 1926

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS, ABERDEEN

PREFACE.

When the Baird Trustees did me the honour of appointing me lecturer, I was given to understand that, while the choice of a subject was left to myself, the Trustees were prepared to regard with favour a course of lectures on Church Music, should I feel disposed to select that topic. It was a great gratification to me, as Convener of the Committee on Psalmody and Hymns of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, to find that Church praise was considered worthy of a place alongside of the weightier matters of doctrine hitherto treated in the series of Baird Lectures; and I gladly availed myself of the opportunity afforded me of dealing with a subject which had always been to me one of deep interest, and which I conceive to be of the highest importance in the worship of the Church.

The lectures being addressed to a popular audience, I have endeavoured, so far as possible, to avoid technicalities which would be intelligible only to those with expert knowledge of music.

The form of worship that I have in view in such suggestions as I have to make is that with which we are familiar in the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, though that has not precluded occasional reference to the more elaborate Cathedral Service of the Church of England. But as the lectures are concerned with the order of worship in the Protestant Church, I have refrained from any attempt to discuss the music of the Mass.

The service that music can render in the worship of the sanctuary is most valuable. One is pleased to note that it is receiving more and more attention from our Church authorities, and that there is a sincere desire, on the part of those to whom the conduct of our Church praise is entrusted, to make the music of our services more dignified and reverent. If these lectures serve in any way to deepen this sense of the importance of the subject, and to encourage the effort to make the music of our Church worship more elevating in its influence on the congregation and more worthy to be laid as an offering upon the divine altar, they will fulfil the purpose I set before me in their preparation.

HADDINGTON,
August, 1926.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

PAGE

THE VALUE OF MUSIC AS AN AID TO WORSHIP . . . 1

LECTURE II.

THE KIND OF MUSIC SUITED FOR USE IN WORSHIP . 47

LECTURE III.

PSALMODY 81

LECTURE IV.

HYMNODY 130

LECTURE V.

THE CHOIR 171

LECTURE VI.

THE ORGAN 213

INDEX 265

LECTURE I.

THE VALUE OF MUSIC AS AN AID TO WORSHIP.

That religion and music have some peculiar affinity one to the other is proved by the long and close association that has subsisted between them, and by the mutual benefit that has resulted therefrom. The intimate association of the two dates back to the earliest times. When the first glimmerings of his artistic powers dawned upon man, his first instinct seems to have been to consecrate them to the service of the gods. "It is," says Plutarch,[1] "a sacred and leading duty of mankind to hymn the gods who have endowed them only with an articulate voice." Among the ancient Assyrians, Egyptians, and Greeks, music in association with song and dance was an indispensable accessory to worship. The Scripture accounts of the arrangements for the temple music witness to the place assigned to it among the Jews, while in the Christian Church music in some form or other, whether in the unpretentious song of the congregation or the elaborate performance of the Cathedral choir, has

[1] *De musica.*

always played an important part in worship. There can be no question as to the mutual benefit arising from this long association. On the side of music, the debt which the art owes to religion for its inspiration and development leaps to the eyes. The history of music during the earlier and most important period of its evolution is inseparably bound up with religion. As Dr. Walford Davies[1] says: "The art of music as we know it spent a serene and prosperous childhood in the care of the Church. It was virtuously and christianly brought up; and a guess may be hazarded that one-fourth if not one-third of all the best music at our disposal to-day is in some real sense Church music." For long the Church was the only school of music. It was in its service that some of the most characteristic forms of the art were evolved. And if the bond uniting the two is less close than of old, if music has emancipated herself from that subservience to religion which might have hampered her further development, she can never forget the debt she owes to the Church which was the nursery of her infancy; and even in the freer scope of her maturer developments, she displays features which, to the eye of the expert, reveal the earlier association in which she was nurtured. Nor is the debt which religion owes to music to be lightly appraised. We have but to think of the great body of hymnody which has been the

[1] *Music and Christian Worship*, p. 3.

offspring of the alliance—the Book of Psalms which will remain to the end of time the joy and solace of the pious soul, the hymns and songs of praise in which from age to age believers have lifted their hearts to God—of the warmth of feeling inspired into the worship of the sanctuary by the union of hearts and voices in the common song of praise, of the deep devotion stirred up by strains which seem to waft our souls to the very gate of heaven, to realise that the art which has made such contribution to the life of the Church has already in great measure repaid the debt which she owes to religion.

In view of the close relation that has subsisted between religion and music and the service music renders in the worship of the Church, the question naturally rises to our lips: Why should music be singled out from the arts for such a prominent place in Church worship? What are the distinctive features that make it such a valuable ally to religion? It is to this question that I direct attention first of all, for a consideration of those characteristics of music which make it specially serviceable as an adjunct to Church worship may help to clarify our ideas as to what is the true function of music in this connexion, and as to what is the kind of music best fitted to fulfil that function.

What is there, then, we ask, in the character of the art of music that makes it receive such general employment in religious worship? One reason that

at once suggests itself is the directness of the appeal that music makes to the feelings. Upon this fact there will be general agreement. There is a group of critics, indeed, who have protested against what they regard as the over-emphasis that has been laid upon this emotional appeal of music. But their protest is to be regarded not as a denial of the fact in question, but as a deprecation of its being put to an illegitimate use, and as a demand for some higher court of æsthetic judgment than the varying emotions roused in the breasts of the audience. "If *music* is to be treated as an *art*," writes Hanslick,[1] one of the leading exponents of the line of criticism to which I am referring, "it is not our feelings, but our imagination which must supply the æsthetic tests. It is as well to make this premise hypothetical, seeing that the soothing effect of music on the human passions is always affirmed with such emphasis, that we are often in doubt whether music is a police regulation, an educational rule, or a medical prescription." But while he thus protests against making the feelings the arbiters on questions of taste, he is quite as ready as those he opposes to admit the influence of music on the feelings. "Far be it from me," he writes,[2] "to underrate the deep emotions which music awakens from their slumbers, or the feelings of joy or sadness which our minds dreamily experience. It is one of the

[1] *The Beautiful in Music*, p. 22. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

most precious and inestimable secrets of nature, that an art should have the power of evoking feelings entirely free from worldly associations, and kindled, as it were, by the spark divine. It is only the unscientific proceeding of deducing *æsthetic principles* from such facts against which we protest."

The fact that music exercises a great influence upon the feelings is one with which we are all familiar. "Of all the liberal arts," said Napoleon,[1] "music has the greatest influence over the passions, and is that to which the legislator ought to give the greatest encouragement. A well-composed song strikes and softens the mind, and produces a greater effect than a moral work, which convinces our reason, but does not warm our feelings nor effect the slightest alteration of our habits." "What passion," asks the poet, "cannot Music raise and quell?"[2] Among the well-known instances in

[1] Quoted Walford Davies, *Music and Christian Worship*, p. 10.

[2] Burton, *Anat. of Melancholy* (Part 2, Sect. 2, Mem. 6, Subs. 3), quotes many testimonies to the power of music as a remedy for melancholy: "Ficinus. Bened. Victor. Faventius are almost immoderate in the commendation of it; a most forcible medicine Jacchinus calls it: Jason Pratensis, 'a most admirable thing, and worthy of consideration, that can so mollify the mind, and stay those tempestuous affections of it.' *Musica est mentis medicina mœstæ*, a roaring-meg against melancholy, to rear and revive the languishing soul; 'affecting not only the ears, but the very arteries, the vital and animal spirits, it erects

history of this susceptibility to the power of music we recall the cases of Saul having the evil spirit exorcised by the playing of David; of Elisha, when required to prophesy, calling for a minstrel that the hand of the Lord might come upon him; of Alexander the Great, now roused to fury, now melted to tears by the song of Timotheus; and of King Eric of Denmark, who was careful to have every weapon put out of reach before he submitted himself to the test of the power of music, but was at last under the strains of the musician roused to such frenzy that he rushed from the room, seized a sword, and killed four of the bystanders. If some of these instances

the mind, and makes it nimble' (Lemnius, *Instit., cap.* 44). This it will effect in the most dull, severe, and sorrowful souls, 'expel grief with mirth, and if there be any clouds, dust, or dregs of cares yet lurking in our thoughts, most powerfully it wipes them all away' (Salisbur, *Polit., lib.* 1, *cap.* 6), and that which is more, it will perform all this in an instant: 'Cheer up the countenance, expel austerity, bring in hilarity (Girald, *Camb., cap.* 12, *Topog. Hiber*), inform our manners, mitigate anger'; Athenæus (*Dipnosophist, lib.* 14, *cap.* 10) calleth it an infinite treasure to such as are endowed with it: *Dulcisonum reficit tristia corda melos, Eobanus Hessus.* Many other properties Cassiodorus (*epist.* 4) reckons up of this our divine music, not only to expel the greatest griefs, but 'it doth extenuate fears and furies, appeaseth cruelty, abateth heaviness, and to such as are watchful it causeth quiet rest: it takes away spleen and hatred,' be it instrumental, vocal, with strings, wind, *Quæ a spiritu sine manuum dexteritate gubernetur*, etc., it cures all irksomeness and heaviness of the soul."

from bygone history seem of doubtful authenticity, we can appeal to more modern instances, certified by personal testimony of the persons concerned. Here is Berlioz's [1] description of the manner in which he was affected by music: "On hearing certain works my vital strength seems first of all doubled; I feel a delicious pleasure with which the reason has no connection; the habit of analysis then unbidden as it were to engender admiration. Emotion, increasing in direct proportion to the energy of grandeur of the composer's ideas then soon produces a strange agitation in the circulation of the blood; my arteries throb violently; tears which, in a general way, indicate the end of the paroxysm, mark in this case only a *progressive* stage which is liable to be much exceeded. In the latter case, spasmodic contractions of the muscles supervene; the limbs tremble; there is a *total numbness of the feet and hands;* a partial paralysis of the nerves of sight and hearing; in short I no longer see or hear perfectly, am seized with giddiness and am half swooning." Or listen to the following from such a clear-minded observer as the aged Goethe in a letter to Zelter: [2] "What a stupendous power music now has over me! Milder's voice, Szymanowska's richness of tone—nay the very performance of the Jägercorps band open my heart as a clenched

[1] *Mid Realms of Song* (*À travers chants*).

[2] *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Zelter*, iii. 332.

fist opens to greet a friend. I am firmly convinced that during the first bar I should have to leave your singing academy." Some people, of course, are more susceptible to this influence than others, just as some are more emotional. As Emerson says: "We boil at different degrees." I recall the scene in David Copperfield when Traddles tells David of how the sister of his fiancée behaved when he announced his engagement to her: "'She clenched both her hands,' said Traddles, looking at me in dismay, 'turned lead colour: became perfectly stiff: and took nothing for two days but toast and water, administered with a teaspoon.' 'What a very unpleasant girl, Traddles,' I remarked. 'Oh, I beg your pardon, Copperfield!' said Traddles, 'she is a very charming girl, but she has a great deal of feeling.'" There are few of us so emotional as the lady in question, or so susceptible to the influence of music as Berlioz, whose account of the feelings roused within him by the performance of certain works borders on the extravagant. But in a minor degree most of us are conscious of the direct action of music upon the emotions, and of the power of its strains to penetrate to the very depths of our being and awaken feelings "that do often lie too deep for tears." As Gurney[1] says: "Music at every stage seems capable of stirring up the strongest excitement that a being who musically typifies that

[1] *Power of Sound*, p. 315.

stage can experience. This enjoyment to the utmost of the best that can be got is exemplified equally in the case of singing birds, and of the gibbon, moved with rapture at his own performance of the chromatic scale, and of the savage repeating over for hours his few monotonous strains and maddened by the rhythmic beat of the drum, and of the ancient Greek spellbound by performances for the like of which we should probably tell a street performer to pass on, and of a circle of Arabs sobbing and laughing by turn in ecstasies of passion at the sound of their native melodies, and of the English child to whom some simple tune of Mozart's reveals the unguessed springs of musical feeling, or of the adult in his loftiest communings with the most inspired utterance of Beethoven."

Why music should exercise this influence upon the feelings is a question to which a variety of answers has been given. It would take me beyond the scope of these lectures to discuss these answers with any fulness. But it may be of interest to note some of them in passing, especially such as may cast any light upon the use of music in Church worship.

There is first of all the purely physical effect produced by certain of the elements of which music is composed. Take the case of sound, *qua* sound. Just as doors and windows sometimes shake under the vibrations of some organ note, so in a minor degree the waves of sound produce a certain physical effect upon the body. Helen Keller, whose case is

well known in psychology, though perfectly deaf was still able to have certain perceptions of music through the vibrations being taken up by certain sensitive organs throughout the body. Indeed, if we are to believe the psychologists we must not think of the sound vibrations as affecting only the organs of hearing. "There is an actual intermeshing of the nerves of hearing with those which control the movement of the larger viscera," I quote the words of one who sums up the views of certain eminent psychologists,[1] "and sound impressions may for this reason provoke massive and unlocalisable conditions (in technical language, kinæsthetic sensations) such as invariably accompany what we call emotion." So Scaliger[2] gives as the explanation of the effects of music: "because the spirits about the heart take in that trembling and dancing air into the body, are moved together, and stirred up with it." It seems like the literal fulfilment of what we sing of in our metrical Psalm :—

> O thou my soul, bless God the Lord ;
> And all that in me is
> Be stirred up his holy name
> To magnify and bless.

If sound, *qua* sound, has indeed this power, we can understand how religion should have enlisted the service of music to kindle the emotions of the worshippers.

[1] Vernon Lee, *Quarterly Review*, 1906, p. 211.
[2] *Exercit.*, 302.

Another feature of importance as contributing to the physical effects of music is the element of movement, under the double aspect of *rhythm* and *pace*. The influence of mere rhythm upon the feelings is witnessed to by the extensive use to which it is put in the cruder stages of the art. It is probable that rhythm was the first element to emerge in the process of musical development, the earliest attempts at music taking the form of rhythmical beating of some percussion instrument without melody at all. "In the beginning was Rhythm," said von Bülow. We read of the warriors of savage tribes sitting for hours listening to the rhythmical beat of a tom-tom, and having their feelings stirred thereby to a state of frenzy. It was doubtless this compelling power of the rhythmical element in music that led to the dance becoming an integral feature of religious worship. It is the outward expression of the dominating power of music, and it reacts by strengthening the power of which it is itself the effect. But indeed we do not require to go back to primitive times to realise the influence of rhythm upon the feelings. We are all conscious of it ourselves. We cannot hear a military band playing a march without falling into step, or listen to a waltz without our body swaying to the rhythm.

> That tall Man, a giant in bulk and in height,
> Not an inch of his body is free from delight;
> Can he keep himself still, if he would? oh, not he!
> The music stirs in him like wind through a tree.[1]

[1] Wordsworth, "Power of Music."

Nor does the influence stop with the external members of the body. The rhythm of the music seems to penetrate deeper, and to compel the inner movements of our conscious life to adapt themselves to its measure.

Such sweet compulsion doth in music lie.

This power of music in virtue of its rhythm to take possession of us and to impose its modes and forms upon the flow of consciousness is one of its most marked characteristics. Its power in this respect is heightened by the further factor of *pace* which it has at its disposal. Having secured control of us by its rhythmical power, it can hurry us along or delay us, work us up almost to the pitch of frenzy or lull the storm of feeling within our breast to a peaceful calm, by the variations of pace to which it subjects us. Here again there are great differences in the susceptibility of different individuals to the influence of musical movement on the feelings. Some are stolid and phlegmatic, and respond but slowly to its appeal. Others are so highly strung that they are swept along by the swing of the music as if borne upon the crest of a wave. But most of us are conscious, to a greater or less degree, of the influence of rhythm and pace in music, feel ourselves being worked up by its *agitato* or soothed by its *tranquillo;* and we can well believe that in primitive times, when the feelings lay more on the surface than they do now, music may have exercised the

power " to swell the soul to rage or kindle soft desire " to a degree we can hardly conceive.

Another line of explanation of the power of music over the feelings is suggested by the theories advanced by Spencer and Darwin as to the origin of music. Spencer's theory is that music takes for its raw material the various modifications of the human voice which are the physiological results of excited feeling, that it intensifies, combines and complicates these, and thereby produces an idealised language of emotion. Only on such lines, he contends, can the expressiveness of music be explained. It is the exaggerated language of emotion in which the composer gives expression to his own feelings, and seeks to awaken feelings of a kindred nature in others. Darwin's theory agrees with Spencer's in regarding music as a development of speech ; but it concentrates upon a particular kind of speech, the amatory. The feelings aroused in us by music seem by their vagueness yet depth like mental reversions to the emotions and thoughts of a long past age. " These facts," he says, " become to a certain extent intelligible if we may assume that musical tones and rhythm were used by the half-human progenitors of man during the season of courtship, when animals of all kinds are excited by the strongest passions. In this case, from the deeply laid principle of inherited association, musical tones would be likely to excite in us, in a vague and indefinite manner, the strong emotion of a long past age."

I do not go into any discussion of these rival theories. They deal with the question of origin, and however ingenious and interesting they may be, one cannot but feel that all such discussion carries us back to a period where, from the nature of the case, we can never get beyond conjecture. Even if we could, it is not evident that our conclusions would be of much value in helping us to realise the power which music wields in its later development. In all questions of evolution we require to hold fast by the Aristotelian maxim that it is the End that is the ultimate principle of explanation. As Professor Pringle Pattison puts it :[1] "All explanation of the higher by the lower is philosophically a hysteron-proteron." In the light of that principle it certainly seems "out of place," as Professor Butcher[2] mildly characterises it, "to maintain that the reason why people now enjoy Beethoven is, that their earliest ancestors of arboreal habits found musical notes to be a telling adjunct to love-making." We may not, then, find that the theories of Spencer and Darwin do much to explain the power exercised by the art of music in its higher developments ; but they serve at any rate to emphasise the indisputability and importance of the fact which these scientists sought to explain, the fact which specially concerns us in our present investigation, the re-

[1] *Man's Place in the Cosmos*, p. 11.

[2] Aristotle, *Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, p. 139.

markable power which music exercises on the emotions.

To turn now to a different way of viewing the subject, we may find some explanation of the directness of appeal which music makes to the feelings in one feature which distinguishes it from painting and sculpture, and to a certain extent from poetry. The painter and the sculptor re-present that which Nature has already presented in the world of objective reality. Not, of course, that they are mere slavish imitators, duplicating that which Nature has already produced. "A mere copier of Nature," says Sir Joshua Reynolds, "can never produce anything great." If the painter sought merely to copy Nature, we might well echo the objection which Browning voices in "Fra Lippo Lippi":—

> His (God's) works
> Are here already; nature is complete:
> Suppose you reproduce her—(which you can't)
> There's no advantage! you must beat her, then.

Nor does the answer seem adequate:—

> For, don't you mark? we're made so that we love,
> First when we see them painted, things we have passed
> Perhaps a hundred times nor cared to see;
> And so they are better, painted—better to us,
> Which is the same thing. Art was given for that.

It seems to assume that art is but a duplication of already existing objects, and to leave out of account the magic whereby the painter compels us

to look with a new interest at things we have passed a hundred times, his power to—

> add the gleam,
> The light that never was, on sea or land,
> The consecration, and the Poet's dream,

whereby he becomes not an imitator but a creator, and reveals to us something of the marvellous charm with which his artistic soul invests the scene. A recent poet [1] seems to me to vindicate the function of art more truly when he says—

> I desire from art
> And from creation not repeated things
> Of every day, not the mean content
> Or discontent of average helpless souls,
> Not passionate abstraction of loveliness,
> But unmatched moments and exceptional deeds,
> And all that cannot happen every day,
> And rare experience of earth's chosen men
> In which I cannot, by my intermitting
> And narrow powers, share unless they are held
> Sublimated and embodied in beauty.[2]

[1] Gordon Bottomley, *Poems of Thirty Years.*

[2] With this we might compare the disquisition on Art by that delightful character, Uncle Hugh, in Edward H. Sothern's *My Remembrances*, p. 21: "Art is the work accomplished by the fellow who has become so inspired by the things he sees with half an eye that, in spite of everything he is told by the fellows who have no eyes, he excites the emotions of the people who can't see very much with two eyes to such an extent that these fellows with two eyes see everything he has seen with his half eye. The thing seen and interpreted is Nature and the interpretation is Art."

But while we thus give full recognition to the spiritual power which raises the plastic arts above mere imitation of Nature, the fact remains that they have a certain objective reality before them which it is their aim to reproduce in however idealised a form. Some, as for instance Emerson, would go the length of maintaining that the whole purpose of these arts is to open our eyes to the beauty of the world around us, and that once they have accomplished this, their *raison d'être* is gone. "The office of painting and sculpture," he says,[1] "seems to be merely initial." "Away with your nonsense of oil and easels, of marble and chisels: except to open our eyes to the masteries of eternal art, they are hypocritical rubbish." That is a view which many of us, perhaps, would hesitate to subscribe. But at any rate it serves to bring before us with arresting emphasis the fact that the arts in question are in the first instance imitative, that they find their subjects in the world of external reality and seek to reproduce in their own way what Nature has first produced, that Nature which according to Sir Thomas Browne is "the Art of God." But with music it is different. It does not find its material in the world around. Broadly speaking, we may say that there is no music there for music to imitate. There are, of course, the singing of the birds, the ripple of the brook, the whistling of the wind, and Lucretius

[1] *Essay on Art.*

would have us believe that this was the school in which man acquired the rudiments of the art, learning song from the birds and instrumental music from the whistling of the zephyrs in the hollow reeds.[1] But even if we admit that this was the beginning, it evidently carries us but a short way. Nobody would seriously contend that there is any world of objective tonal reality for music to reproduce, as there is in form and colour for sculpture and painting. We should be prepared to assert that music is the least imitative of the arts ; for what is there for it to imitate ? And it is with rather a shock of surprise that we find Aristotle, and indeed the Greeks generally, maintaining that music is instead of the least, the most imitative of the arts. But the surprise is only momentary, for on examination we find that the reality which music seeks to imitate is not without but within. Music aims, so the Greeks thought, at reproducing states of feeling and dispositions of the mind, at not merely reproducing but to a certain extent controlling and moulding them by its influence. Hence the Greek view of the educative power of music, upon which I do not dwell now. The point which I wish specially to bring out at present is that music, as compared with sculpture and painting, is much more subjective in character. They carry us, in the first instance at any rate, out to the world around. They turn our

[1] *De rerum natura*, v. 1379 *sqq.*

eyes and our minds to something that has objective existence apart from ourselves; and much of the mental exercise which they stimulate is concerned with the comparison of the artistic reproduction with the original upon which it is based. But in music there is no such external reality with which to test the accordance of the music. Even the boldest of our programme musicians can succeed only to a feeble degree in calling up any definite scene or action before the minds of their audience, and this sometimes by devices which are not purely musical in character. It is not the province of music to reproduce the world of objective reality. It cannot place a scene before our eyes. At best it can give, as Schopenhauer [1] says, "only the quintessence of life and events, never these themselves." "Music," he says elsewhere,[2] "does not speak of things: it speaks of pure weal and woe (the only realities for will), and therefore makes such direct appeal to the heart, while it has nothing to say to the head." That puts the matter in a nutshell. It is because music has no objective reality to reproduce, but finds its content in the realm of feeling, that its appeal to the heart is so direct and its sway over the emotion so potent.

I have suggested the appeal which music makes to the feelings as one of the reasons why the art should receive such a prominent place in Church worship;

[1] *Will*, i. 339. [2] *Phil. Aphor.*, p. 196.

and in connexion therewith have permitted myself a brief digression to consider one or two of the reasons why music should possess to so high a degree this power of appeal. I proceed now to suggest some other reasons why music seems peculiarly fitted for employment in Church worship. The next with which I shall deal is somewhat analogous to that which we have just been considering; but inasmuch as it presents the subject from a different point of view, it seems worthy of separate treatment—I refer to the serviceability of music as a channel for the expression of feeling. Music not only *im*presses the feelings, but likewise *ex*presses them, not only acts upon them from without but serves as an outlet to them from within. This is only to be expected from what we have already seen as to the character of the art. If music finds its subject-matter not in the world of reality without but in the realm of feeling within, then evidently it must in some way be peculiarly qualified to serve as a channel for the expression of feeling. "Tone," says Wagner,[1] "is the immediate utterance of feeling and has its physical seat within the heart, whence start and whither flow the waves of life-blood. Through the sense of hearing, tone urges forth from the feeling of one heart to the feeling of its fellow: the grief and joy of the emotional-man impart themselves directly to his counterpart through the manifold expression of vocal tone; and where the outer

[1] *The Art-Work of the Future*, p. 91.

corporeal man finds his limits of expressing to the eye the qualities of those inner feelings of the heart he fain would utter and convey, there steps in to his aid the sought-for envoy, and takes his message through the voice to hearing, through hearing to the feelings of the heart." It is because the music is the expression of the composer's own feelings that it makes such direct appeal to the feelings of the hearer. "From the heart it has come," wrote Beethoven on the Kyrie of his Mass in D, "may it reach the heart again!" In regard to the power of music thus to express the feelings, I would again quote Hanslick, one of the most vigorous opponents of the tendency to attach what he regards as undue importance to the element of feeling in connexion with music. While denying that the composer embodies his own feelings in the music he has composed, he confesses that in the case of the extempore player "the expression which he elicits from the keys may assume almost the vividness of speech. Whoever," he continues, "has enjoyed this absolute freedom of speech, in total oblivion of all surroundings, this spontaneous revelation of his inner self, will know without further explanation how love, jealousy, joy, and sorrow rush out of their secret recesses, undisguised and yet secure, celebrating their own triumphs, singing their own lays, and fighting their own battles, until their lord and master calls them back, quieted, and yet disquieting." [1]

[1] *The Beautiful in Music*, p. 106 f.

If such ability to express the feelings in music be granted to the extempore player, one wonders why it should be denied to the composer. However, for our purpose it is sufficient that there be this admission of the power of music to serve as a vehicle for feeling. It is because of it that music proves such a valuable adjunct to Church worship; for the worshipper is there not merely as an inert listener but as an active participant, not merely to have his emotions played upon by the music but to employ it to give utterance to the feeling that is welling up within him. And just because music has this power of serving as an outlet for feeling, he is able to appropriate and thrill with his own heart-felt emotion the sentiments in which the devotion of the worshippers is poured forth.

And here I would draw attention to a characteristic feature of the art which throws some light upon its value in this respect. We have seen that music is more subjective than sculpture and painting in respect that it does not find its material in the world of objective reality. There is another respect in which this subjectivity manifests itself, in respect, namely, that its creations have not the permanence of those of the plastic arts. The sculptor produces his statue, the painter his picture, and these creations, once they have been produced, remain there as solid, actual realities:—

> Still on the Painter's fresco, from the hand
> Of God takes Eve the life-spark whereunto
> She trembles up from nothingness.[1]

[1] Browning, "Parleyings with Certain People—Charles Avison."

But the product of the musician's art is not such an actually existing thing. The sensuous material in which he works is sound, and it is the very nature of sound to pass away in the moment of its being. The musician may exclaim with Abt Vogler :—

Would that the structure brave, the manifold music I build,
Bidding my organ obey, calling its keys to their work,
. . . . . .
Would it might tarry . . ., this beautiful building of mine,
This which my keys in a crowd pressed and importuned to raise !

But it is a vain wish. It was Schlegel, I think, who called architecture " frozen music," but there is no frozen music in reality, *pace* Baron Munchausen. It is a hopeless task to attempt to " give momentary feeling permanence." The composer can, indeed, commit his thoughts to paper. But a musical score is not music, but only the possibility of music. Music comes only with the actual performance of the notes which the composer has set down. And this necessity of performance, of *reproduction,* which is one of the most characteristic features of the art, is of special value because of the opportunity it gives for the pouring forth of the feelings on the part of the performer. Just as the composer has made the music which he has produced the channel for the expression of his own feeling, so the performer in his *re*production thrills the music with the feelings of his own heart.

Note what bearing this has upon the employment

of music in Church worship. It gives the worshipper the opportunity for that active participation in the liturgy which converts it from a dead *opus operatum* into a living act of worship. Throughout the whole of the service, indeed, there must be such active co-operation on the part of the worshipper. He must be echoing in his own heart the prayer which is offered by the minister. It is he, not the preacher, that must make practical application of the sermon. But in the praise of the sanctuary the participation of the worshipper is even more pronounced. He not only echoes it in his heart, he takes it up with his own voice, and joins directly in singing the praise of God. It is here that the double power of music, to awaken and to express feeling, comes into play, —to awaken feeling, for the strains in which the congregation sound the praise of God will arouse corresponding emotion in the breast of the individual worshipper,—to express feeling, for as he lifts up his voice and joins in the common song, he will find that it is an admirable medium for the utterance of his own feeling, and that he can make this music, which lives only as we reproduce it, vibrate with something of the emotion that thrills his own being.

While we recognise the relation between music and the feelings, whether as stirring them up or giving them expression, we must not conclude that this relation to feeling is so clear and definite that we can translate the one into the other with positive certainty. Mendelssohn, indeed, had a theory that

"notes have as definite a meaning as words—perhaps even more definite"; [1] but I should say that there are few of us who would subscribe to that. Rather we feel that there is a certain indefiniteness about music which is one of its chiefest charms. There are, of course, certain broad lines of demarcation within which certain groups of feeling range themselves. Such opposite poles as joy and sorrow, triumph and despair, rage and peace, will find expression in strains of such diverse character that there will be little likelihood of confusion. And yet even here one speaks with diffidence when one remembers the way in which the same music has been employed to suggest emotion of the most opposite character. There is a wide difference between the sentiment of "Scots wha hae" and "The Land o' the Leal," yet the music is the same for both. Or again the Chorale which Bach uses so frequently in the St. Matthew Passion was originally, we are told, a love song; and the composer, as if not content with showing what a world of pathos he could inspire into it by the various settings of it in the Passion, uses it at the close of the Christmas Oratorio as a song of triumph. Boyé, a contemporary of Gluck, remarked that the music to which the composer had set the text—

J'ai perdu mon Eurydice,
Rien n'égale mon malheur,

[1] *Letters*, July, 1831.

would have served equally well for the words—

J'ai trouvé mon Eurydice,
Rien n'égale mon bonheur.

These instances warn us against too great confidence in identifying any piece of music with a certain class of feeling. But without going the length of maintaining that the very opposite poles of feeling are musically indistinguishable, we may recognise that there is room for great difference of opinion as to the sentiment expressed by any piece of music, and that different persons may be affected differently by the same strains, or may imbue them with very different emotions when they reproduce them. "Different ages," says Schumann,[1] "select different bases for their texts and pictures: where the youth of eighteen hears a world-famous occurrence in a musical work, a man only perceives some rustic event, while the musician probably never thought of either, but simply gave the best music that he happened to feel within him just then." The phenomenon is not peculiar to music. It holds in other relations as well. "The story," says Helvetius,[2] "is well known of a parson and a gay lady. They had heard that the moon was peopled—believed it—and telescope in hand were attempting to discover the inhabitants. 'If I am not mistaken,' says the lady, who looked first, 'I perceive two

[1] Quoted Gurney, *Power of Sound*, p. 357.
[2] *De l'Esprit*, Discours I., chap. ii.

shadows; they bend toward each other, and, I have no doubt, are two happy lovers.' 'Lovers, madam,' says the divine, who looked next; 'oh, fie! the two shadows you saw are the two steeples of a cathedral.' This story is the history of man. In general, we perceive only in things what we are desirous of finding: on the earth, as in the moon, various perpossessions make us always recognise either lovers or cathedrals." It is the same in literature. "What can we see or acquire," asks Emerson,[1] "but what we are? You have observed a skilful man reading Virgil. Well, that author is a thousand works to a thousand persons. Take the book into your two hands, and read your eyes out, you will never find what I find." If this holds with books where we express our meaning in words, much more does it hold with music whose language of tone lacks the precision of speech. Hauptmann[2] has a suggestive illustration. He compares music to algebra, speech to arithmetic. Music expresses as a universal what

[1] *Essays: Spiritual Laws.*

[2] "Music may be compared to algebra, speech to arithmetic. What music contains in a general expression, language can only express as particular. An algebraical formula shows the factors in their mutual dependence and operation: the factors and the product in one. Arithmetic shows either the factors alone or the product alone. Algebra gives the universal meaning for infinitely many particular values that may be taken. Music is like it in this. One

words can express only as a particular. Algebra, for instance, may give the formula $a + b = c$. But to express that arithmetically you must assign a particular value to the various symbols, as, e.g. $2 + 3 = 5$. What does this piece of music mean? To answer that question you must come down from algebra to arithmetic. But your answer does not exhaust the meaning of the music. It means one thing to one, another thing to another. Each of us supplies an arithmetical value to the algebraical symbol; and though the values be entirely dif-

has often seen the experiment made of expressing the contents of a piece of instrumental music in words, in a poem. The result can never be satisfactory. If the algebraical expression makes $a + b = c$, and one chooses to replace this by $2 + 3 = 5$ with arithmetical values, this application of the formula is certainly quite a correct one. But there is an infinite number of other values to be put for a and b, which yield c as another sum, and where the combination of factors fulfils the purport of the formula just as correctly. So too the same music might be expounded verbally in the most different ways, and of none of them could it be said that it was exhaustive or that it contained the proper and the whole meaning of the music; for that is contained with the utmost definiteness only in the music itself. Music has not an indefinite sense; it tells the same tale to everyone; it speaks to men, and says only what men feel. But ambiguity comes to light when each in his own way seeks to comprehend in a particular thought the impression of feeling that he receives, trying to fix the fluid element of music and to utter the unutterable" (*Harmony and Metre*, Eng. trans., p. 319).

ferent, though I say $2 + 3 = 5$, and another makes it $3 + 6 = 9$, we are still giving a true interpretation to the algebra of music. This indefiniteness of music—Hauptmann objects to the term, and styles it rather *Mehrdeutigkeit*, manifoldness of meaning—and faculty of lending itself to a variety of interpretation seems to me to enhance its value as an instrument of public worship. One of the dangers that beset us in our worship is a tendency to allow it to become formal and stereotyped, to use certain rites or forms without identifying ourselves with them in spirit and permeating them with our own personal feeling. The important thing with regard to any act of worship is not what it means in itself, but what it means to the worshipper who engages in it, what is the emotion with which he imbues it. The God who is Spirit can be worshipped truly only in spirit ; and it is one of the qualifications of music for employment in Church worship that, in virtue of the characteristic to which I am now referring, it provides such opportunity for the individual worshippers to thrill with their own personal feelings the song which they raise in common with their fellow-worshippers, and in the deepest sense of the word to appropriate, i.e. to make their very own by pouring their soul into it, the common sacrifice of praise which is laid upon the altar.

It may be that this indefiniteness which is characteristic of music is due to the fact that what it seeks to express is something ultimately indefinable

in terms of thought, something so deep and unfathomable that the plummet of the understanding is inadequate to sound it. "Who is there," asks Carlyle,[1] "that in logical words can express the effect that music has on us? A kind of inarticulate, unfathomable speech, which leads us to the edge of the Infinite, and lets us for moments gaze into that!" It was something of this kind that Goethe had in his mind when he spoke of the *dæmonic* element in music, which he regarded as the characteristic of the art that made it peculiarly suited for use in worship. "The dæmonic," he explained,[2] "is that which cannot be accounted for by understanding and reason. . . . It is present in music in the highest degree, for music stands too high for any understanding, and an efficacy goes forth from it which masters everything, and of which no one is able to give an account. Religious worship can therefore not do without it. It is one of the foremost means to work upon men with marvellous power." This dæmonic element to which Goethe refers is somewhat analogous to the non-rational for which a place has been claimed in religion by Otto in his interesting book "The Holy"; and indeed Otto quotes with approbation those passages of Goethe in which some of the characteristic features of what Otto calls the

[1] *Heroes and Hero-Worship:* "The Hero as Poet."

[2] Eckermann, *Conversations with Goethe*, 1831, 2nd March, 8th March.

"numinous"[1] are emphasised. But he does not agree with Goethe in regarding music as an adequate medium for inspiring a sense of the "numinous." "Even the most consummate Mass-music," he says,[2] "can only give utterance to the holiest, most 'numinous' moment in the Mass—the moment of transubstantiation—by sinking into stillness: no momentary pause, but an absolute cessation of sound long enough for us 'to hear the Silence' itself; and no devotional moment in the whole Mass approximates in impressiveness to this 'keeping silence before the Lord.'" With the recollection of the impressiveness of the two minutes' silence on Armistice Day in a crowded church, we may admit that such sudden silence interposed in the course of any ceremony must have a deeply solemnising effect. But this does not disparage the claim of music in its highest flights to produce upon the hearer a profound impression, a sense as of religious awe, a wafting of the spirit to a purer region; and it is in virtue of this power that it seems peculiarly fitted for use in religious worship.[3] "It strikes in me a

[1] A word coined by Otto to denote "the holy," *minus* the ethical content with which the term *holy* has become charged.

[2] *The Holy*, p. 72.

[3] "This morning the music of a brass band which had stopped under my windows moved me almost to tears. It exercised an indefinable, nostalgic power over me; it set me dreaming of another world, of infinite passion and supreme

deep fit of devotion," says Sir Thomas Browne,[1] "and a profound contemplation of the First Composer. There is something in it of Divinity, more than the ear hears." It can inspire a sense of awe and mystery to a degree that none of the other arts can rival, save perhaps architecture. It can lull the troubled mind to such peace that we might well think that the musician had caught the secret from Him at whose command the angry waters sank to calm. It can touch the most tender chords in the human heart and awaken yearnings which seem to rise from the profoundest depths of our being. "These vague feelings of unexperienced felicity which music arouses," says Herbert Spencer,[2] "those indefinite impressions of an unknown ideal life which it calls up, may be considered as a prophecy, the fulfilment of which music itself aids." But they may be considered as more than that. "Music," said the American poet, Sidney Lanier, "is love in search of a word." And as we recall what St. Augustine said about our troubled souls finding rest only in the God who had made them for Himself, we can well believe that in some minds and in some connexions, at any rate, those vague

happiness. Such impressions are the echoes of Paradise in the soul; memories of ideal spheres, whose sad sweetness ravishes and intoxicates the heart" (Amiel, *Journal*, 17th March, 1870).

[1] *Religio Medici*, § 9. [2] *Essays*, II. 426.

yearnings which music excites may be considered as a prophecy, the fulfilment of which is to be found not in music itself but in that eternal Love which is seeking to win an entrance into our hearts.

Sorrow is hard to bear, and doubt is slow to clear,
Each sufferer says his say, his scheme of the weal and woe :
But God has a few of us whom He whispers in the ear ;
The rest may reason and welcome : 'tis we musicians know.[1]

Music seems to be charged with such directly religious significance to some persons, at any rate, whose testimony the psychologists have collected for us. "Music is the handmaid of religion," writes one observer,[2] "because its tone and rhythm awaken something deep within us. . . . Musical appreciation and the God experience are frequently so related as to be practically inseparable. . . . Affective reactions to music are frequently indistinguishable from a God experience, and many have described the same sort of ecstatic feelings induced by music as are characteristic of ecstatic mystical states." "Music seems to bring to one young woman a similar feeling to that of the religious mystic. 'I sometimes feel as though I suddenly understood the whole universe!'"[3] If such be, to any considerable extent, the effect produced by music upon the listener, then one can well understand its introduction into divine worship.

[1] Browning, "Abt Vogler."

[2] Mudge, *God-experience*, p. 23 f. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

Another reason for the use of music in religious worship is its close association with two of the sister arts which are or have been likewise employed for this purpose, the arts of dancing and poetry. Music and dancing as we meet them among primitive peoples are but different manifestations of the same tendency, the impulse to give outward expression to some strong feeling. In the one case the feeling finds expression in sound, in the other in bodily movements. "The corporeal-man," says Wagner,[1] speaking of the dance, "proclaims his sensations of weal and woe directly in and by those members of his body which feel the hurt or pleasure; his whole body's sense of weal or woe he expresses by means of correlated and complementary movements of all, or of the most expressionable of these members." With the Greeks dancing was raised to the level of a fine art. Aristotle [2] claimed that it imitates emotions and actions by rhythmical movement, while Lucian in his treatise on the subject maintained that it was not inferior to tragedy in emotional capacity. It was used by the Greeks in religious festivals to symbolise mysteries known only to the initiated, or to give pantomimic representation of some of the mythical incidents which were celebrated in the act of worship. We meet with numerous references to the religious use of the dance in the Old Testament, not indeed

[1] *The Art-work of the Future*, p. 100.
[2] *Poetics*, i. 5.

with such deep symbolical significance as among the Greeks, but more as the naïve expression of feeling. We recall the dance of the Israelites round the golden calf, in imitation, perhaps, of similar celebrations in Egypt; of the daughters of Shiloh at the yearly festival; of David when the ark was brought to Jerusalem; of the priests of Baal round the altar on Carmel. In the Psalms there are occasional references to the sacred dance round the altar or sanctuary, which, though not enjoined in the law, evidently formed a part of the celebration (Ps. xxvi. 6; xlii. 4). A relic of this use of the dance in religious worship is preserved in the religious procession which is still in some places a feature of certain religious celebrations. That music would be associated with the dance is a matter of course. It may have been very crude and elementary in character, but some kind of rhythmical accompaniment would be necessary to secure uniformity of movement on the part of the dancers.

It is interesting to note the influence that dancing has had upon the sister art with which it was associated so closely in primitive worship. The regularity of accent which it demands has entered into the very texture of music and has created those rhythmical periods which provide the thematic material for all development of form. But not only this, it has likewise contributed to the evolution of those larger forms into which this material is worked up. At one period in the history of music

the various forms of instrumental music in use were nearly all different kinds of dance measures. The suite, which was the prevailing instrumental form, was but a string of such dance measures. And while it has given place to the sonata, it should not be forgotten that the nobler form is really a development of the suite, so that in its highest achievements music still shows traces of the less imposing art with which it was associated at the beginning. One notes occasional evidences of a desire upon the part of the Church authorities to disavow the sister whose associations were regarded as not altogether creditable. Though music and dance had been so closely allied in primitive worship, they had parted company by the time of the early Christian Church, and dancing had been given over to the theatre. The former association of music with dancing was looked upon as by no means to its credit. Efforts were made to purge the music of the Church of all that was redolent of the early alliance, and in the plainsong which was evolved within the Church, a successful attempt was made to break away from the tyranny of rhythmic regularity characteristic of the dance. For a time the Church thus succeeded in closing her portals against the influence of the dance. But she has been forced to capitulate at last, and to admit the "measured music" against which she had so long stood out. The free rhythm of the Gregorian gave place in England to the more rigid form of the Anglican chant; the unbarred plainsong

melodies were supplanted by the chorale and psalm and hymn tunes, the roots of which go down into the folk-music where the influence of the dance is strong; while in its higher flights the music of the Church was forced to adopt a regularity of structure that it had been able to dispense with in the purely liturgical use of music in the service.

The other art whose affinity with music helps to account for the place music holds in divine worship is the art of poetry. The two are closely associated in their origin :—

> Blest pair of Sirens, pledges of Heaven's joy,
> Sphere-born harmonious sisters, Voice and Verse.

They are both the outcome of the tendency to give vocal expression to feeling; but starting from the same point, they have pursued different courses. Music has taken the sound in which feeling found expression purely as sound, and has developed the possibilities of expression that revealed themselves in the realm of tone. Poetry has taken the sound which expresses feeling not purely as sound but as the symbol of thought. It does give a certain value, indeed, to sound as such, for he would be a poor poet who had no ear for the musical clang of the words he employs. But the words are never there for the sound alone. They have a meaning, and whatever value they may have in virtue of their sound alone is subsidiary to that which they have as symbols whereby they bring the thought of the

poet before us. And so the two arts which were one in their origin have gone their respective ways: the one taking sound as the direct expression of feeling, and developing to the full the resources of this material regarded in its purely sensuous aspect; the other taking sound mainly in its symbolical character as expressive of thought and feeling, and using it as an instrument whereby—

> as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shape, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.

It is in song that we have the meeting again of these two arts which have such affinity. The union is a most happy one, for each can supply what the other lacks. By concentrating upon pure tone as the expression of feeling, music has forfeited the definiteness and precision that attach to language as the symbol of thought. On the other hand, what language has gained in definiteness by reducing sound to the mere symbol of thought, it has lost in emotional power as compared with music. In song the two are wedded together and contribute each its quota to the general effect. The words of the poem give definiteness to the feeling expressed by the music. The strains may suggest sadness or yearning or joy, but beyond that they cannot go. There may be a hundred different causes for these emotions, but unless like some of our programme musicians we invest the music with something of the power of

Lord Burleigh's shake of the head,[1] we cannot determine more precisely the occasion and significance of the emotion expressed by the music. And while the poem serves to give definiteness to the emotion expressed by the music, the music in turn contributes life and warmth and depth of feeling to the thought expressed in the words. It gives vocal expression to the music that is latent in the verse, that seems to be yearning for some worthier channel than language.[2] Of all artistic combinations that of

[1] *Sneer:* "Now what did he mean by that?"

Puff: "You don't take it?"

Sneer: "No, I don't, upon my soul."

Puff: "Why, by that shake of the head, he gave you to understand that even though they had justice in their cause, and wisdom in their measures—yet, if there was not a greater spirit shown on the part of the people, the country would at last fall a sacrifice to the hostile ambition of the Spanish monarchy" (Sheridan, *The Critic*, iii. 1).

[2] "Melodie ist das sinnliche Leben der Poesie. Wird nicht der geistliche Inhalt eines Gedichts zum sinnlichen Gefühl durch die Melodie?—empfindet man nicht in dem Lied der Mignon ihre ganze sinnliche Stimmung durch die Melodie? und erregt diese Empfindung nicht wieder zu neuen Erzeugungen? Da will der Geist zu schrankenloser Allgemeinheit sich ausdehnen, wo alles in Allem sich bildet zum Bett der Gefühle, die aus dem einfachen musikalischen Gedanken entspringen, und die sonst ungeahnt verhallen würden; das ist Harmonie, das spricht sich in meinen Symphonieen aus, der Schmelz vielseitiger Formen wogt dahin in einem Bett bis zum Ziel. Da fühlt man wohl, dass ein Ewiges, Unendliches, nie ganz zu Umfassendes in allem geistigen liege, und obschon ich bei meinen Werken

poetry and music is one of the happiest. Matthew Arnold [1] has given noble expression to the power which music wields to invest the words of the poet with a depth of passion and a power of appeal far beyond the resources of language :—

Miserere, Domine !
The words are utter'd, and they flee.
Deep is their penitential moan,
Mighty their pathos, but 'tis gone.
They have declared the spirit's sore
Sore load, and words can do no more.
Beethoven takes them then—those two
Poor, bounded words—and makes them new ;
Infinite makes them, makes them young ;
Transplants them to another tongue,
Where they can now, without constraint,
Pour all the soul of their complaint,
And roll adown a channel large
The wealth divine they have in charge.
Page after page of music turn,
And still they live and still they burn,
Eternal, passion-fraught, and free—
Miserere, Domine !

immer die Empfindung des Gelingens habe, so fühle ich einen ewigen Hunger was mir eben erschöpft schien, mit dem letzten Paukenschlag, mit dem ich meinen Genuss, meine musikalische Ueberzeugung den Zuhörern einkeilte, wie ein Kind von neuem anzufangen" (Thayer, *Ludwig van Beethoven's Leben*, iii. 148).

So Schiller wrote : "When I sit down to express an idea, I am more often possessed by the musical essence of it than by a clear conception of its contents, as to which I frequently can hardly make up my mind."

[1] Epilogue to Lessing's *Laocoon*.

Another characteristic of music worthy of consideration as accounting for its use in worship is its associative power. A strain of music readily calls up memories of the conditions in which it has been heard before. Perhaps more allowance should be made for this tendency in music than is usually done. It may be that much of its appeal to the feelings is not so direct as we imagine, but is strongly reinforced by this power of association. It is along these lines, probably, that we must seek the explanation of much that we read about the music of ancient Greece. When we hear what the Greek philosophers say of the ethical tendency of music and of its educational value in the formation of character, we feel somewhat at a loss. They seem to invest it with a far greater power than we are conscious of its wielding amongst ourselves. In the *Republic*, for instance, Socrates is represented as proposing to admit only the Dorian and the Phrygian modes in the model state, "the strain of courage and the strain of temperance"; and in the *Laws* Plato declares that music, the gift of the gods, was never intended, "as the many foolishly and blasphemously suppose," merely to give us pleasure. It is a potent instrument in education; and where there is licence in the music there will be anarchy in the state.[1] These Greek views of the

[1] Cp. Cicero, *De legibus*, ii.: "Assentior enim Platoni, nihil tam facile in animos teneros atque molles influere, quam varios canendi sonos. Quorum dici vix potest quanta

ethical influence of music become more intelligible to us when we remember that with the Greeks music had not the independent position as an art that it has now. It was merely an accompaniment to the song or the dance, and was used in connexion with these on certain definite occasions. It was largely in virtue of these associations that it exercised the influence that it did. "When there are no words," says Plato,[1] "it is very difficult to recognise the meaning of harmony or rhythm, or to see that any worthy object is imitated by them." The strains of the particular mode called up the conditions with which that mode was always associated—the sentiments which found expression in the poem recited to its accompaniment, the dance in which the emotions suitable to the occasion bodied themselves forth. If we keep in mind this subservience of Greek music to the arts with which it was associated

sit vis in utramque partem. Namque et incitat languentes, et languefacit excitatos, et tum remittit animos, tum contrahit: civitatumque hoc multarum in Graecia interfuit, antiquum vocum servare modum: quarum mores lapsi ad mollitiem, pariter sunt immutati cum cantibus: aut hac dulcedine corruptelaque depravati, ut quidam putant; aut, cum severitas eorum ob alia vitia cecidisset, tum fuit in auribus animisque mutatis etiam huic mutationi locus. Quamobrem ille quidem sapientissimus Græciæ vir, longeque doctissimus, valde hanc labem veretur. Negat enim mutari posse musicas leges sine mutatione legum publicarum."

[1] *Laws*, ii. 669 E.

and its employment in connexion with them at certain definite celebrations, religious, patriotic, or social, the ethical characteristics with which it is endowed by ancient writers becomes more intelligible to us. In the same way it is possible that many of the qualities with which we invest certain types of music may be due to association rather than to anything in the essential character of the music itself. They call up certain feelings in us because we have always been accustomed to hear strains of that kind associated with these feelings. I should think it likely that much of the character which we associate with the term "sacred music" is to be explained on these lines. What do we mean by sacred music ? [1] If there are no words to give the flavour of sanctity, what is it in the music that induces the feeling of devotion ? That is not an easy question to answer. But I believe that a good part of the explanation is to be found in the associations that are excited by the music in question. What we think of as peculiarly sacred music is the kind of music that has, as Spitta [2] says, "grown up within the bosom of the Church." Through this association with Church worship it

[1] "Nothing has indeed been a greater hindrance to English music than this phrase, which, as used by far too many persons from Handel's day to our own, has no sort of warrant from religion or art or common sense, or anything beyond a fetish-like superstition" (Walker, *History of Music in England*, p. 236).

[2] *John Sebastian Bach*, Bk. III., chap. iv.

inevitably awakens within us those feelings of devotion and reverence appropriate thereto. As I have already said there is a certain indefiniteness in music in virtue of which different people are differently affected by the same strains. But if it were not for the power of association with which it is invested, I am sure that this indefiniteness would be vastly increased, and that music would be far more uncertain of the response it would awaken than it is. We have often heard from our fellow-countrymen beyond the seas of the emotions stirred within them by the old familiar Psalm-tunes, how they are carried back in imagination to the little church in which they worshipped as children, and melted to tears by the tender memories called up. That is but an extreme instance of the associative power which music exercises over all of us. Much of its value as an accessory to worship lies in the associations that attach to it, and the many hallowed memories that are awakened by the type of music which seems to breathe the very spirit of the Church which gave it birth.

There is one other characteristic of music worthy of note as tending to account for its use in religious worship, viz. its social nature. Church worship is essentially social in character. When men plead that they can worship God as well in the home as in the Church, they overlook this social element in public worship. There is an individual and a social side in religion, and if our religion is not to become one-sided and unhealthy, we must make due provision for each. If

we are to worship the God who is Spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, our worship must be something individual, something which we thrill with our own personal feeling, an offering which is laid upon our own private altar. But if we are to worship the Being who is God and Father of us all, we must likewise realise our fellowship with our brethren who are privileged likewise to address Him as Father. We are not a collection of self-centred units. We are all members one of another, and only as we realise that great truth can we worthily worship the great Head of the Church through whom we are knit one to another in a fellowship of love. Both sides, the individual and the social, are essential to religion. In what I have said before I have tried to show how music can prove of assistance in connexion with the realisation of the individual element in religion. In so far as we take the words of the song of praise on our lips and chant them with our own voice, we identify ourselves with them and inform them with our personal feeling. We praise God "each in his own tongue," and the words of our song seem to throb with life as they issue from our lips. But music does justice to the social element in religion as well. It is a *common* song of praise that we raise. If the singing be in harmony, then the sense of our relationship one to another is vividly brought home to us. Just as the various parts of the harmony fulfil their function only when the others are added, so we are reminded that in

the great choir of human life we are all dependent one upon the other. But I do not press this aspect of the matter as the ordinary worshipper confines himself to singing the "people's part." But even then the social element in worship is brought home to him by the music. He sings not as a soloist but as one of a number. When the sense of solidarity, of unity of heart and feeling with his fellow-worshippers, of collaboration with them in a united effort, is present, then the music has fulfilled its purpose. It should be the great aim of congregational singing to realise this. That music has it in its power to contribute to this result, there can be no doubt. It can envelop the individual worshippers, as it were, in an atmosphere of music, removing the feeling of isolation and strengthening the sense of unity and fellowship. We recall how our Lord laid emphasis upon the social side of religion by making a supper the central rite of His Church. The common song fulfils the same purpose as the common meal; and music will have indeed amply justified her introduction into the worship of the sanctuary, if she can claim to have strengthened that sense of fellowship which is essentially the spirit of true religion, the spirit of the Church of Christ.

LECTURE II.

THE KIND OF MUSIC SUITED FOR USE IN WORSHIP.

In my first lecture I examined some of the characteristics of the art of music that make it suitable for use in Church worship. I propose now to change the point of view, and, starting from the side of worship, to enquire what is the kind of music suitable for use in this connexion. *In this connexion,* i.e. in the worship of the Church—let us be quite clear that this is the province that concerns us. It is not the spiritual value of music in itself that we have to consider. One can conceive a strong plea being put in for recognition of music as fraught with deep religious significance in itself, apart from any association with the liturgy of the Church. If Beauty be indeed an absolute value, an authentic revelation of God of equal validity with Goodness and Truth, then it might be argued that the artist no less than the minister of religion has a certain priestly function, and that the appreciation awakened in the public to whom his work makes appeal is in itself an act of worship well-pleasing in God's sight.

"Thus," says Beethoven,[1] "does art ever represent the deity, and man's relation to it is religion. What we achieve by art, that is of God, divine prompting, which assigns to human powers a goal which they may attain." One may admit that there is a certain measure of truth in such a position. If we are in earnest in asserting the absolute value of the beautiful, then we must take a much more serious view of art than is customary, and it is a thing greatly to be desired that we should do so. Art is no mere superfluity of life which practical men can afford to ignore, no idle pastime for the rich and leisured classes alone. It is a vital element in human life which we can disregard only to our spiritual loss.

> Allow not nature more than nature needs,
> Man's life's cheap as beast's.

It is right that we should assign a high place to art in our scheme of life, for it is, to use Dr. Percy Dearmer's phrase,[2] "a sacrament of the unseen," the sensible symbol of an eternal spiritual reality. It is right that the artist should magnify his office as a prophet charged with a divine revelation. "I well know," said Beethoven,[3] "that God is nearer to me in my art than to others. I commune with Him without fear; at all times I have acknowledged and understood Him. And I am not fearful concerning

[1] Thayer, *Ludwig van Beethoven's Leben*, iii. 149.
[2] *Art and Religion*, p. 4.
[3] Thayer, *loc. cit.*, p. 146.

my music. No evil fate can befall it; and he to whom it is intelligible must be freed from all the misery that others drag about with them." The man who has such a lofty conception of his art may well feel as if he had been consecrated to a kind of priesthood. But whatever truth there may be about such views, they are concerned with art considered as a thing of value in itself apart from any association with religious worship. But it is in this connexion alone that we have to consider the function of music here. So we shall confine ourselves to this aspect of the art, and keeping Church worship before us as the end to be advanced, proceed to consider what is the kind of music that may prove most suitable for this purpose.

In the previous lecture I emphasised the fact that it was in great measure in virtue of its appeal to the feelings that music proved of such service in religious worship, and it is to this aspect of the art that I turn first in considering what kind of music is most suitable. Of course this phrase "appeal to the feelings" covers a wide range of phenomena. There is a vast difference between the frenzy induced in the savage by the beating of a tom-tom and the peace and solace that steal over the heart as we listen to one of Bach's Organ Chorale Preludes. In the one case the musical agency brought into play is far cruder and more primitive than in the other, and the results produced are likewise more pronounced and palpable. And, generally speaking, we

may say that the lower we start in the scale of musical evolution, the more obvious and striking are the effects produced on the feelings of the audience. For in these lower stages, as I have already said, the influence of music upon the feelings is due to the elemental action of sound and rhythm rather than to the artistic elaboration of the composer's handiwork. Consequently we find that the action of music was far more pronounced, so far as external manifestation is concerned, in the case of the ancient races than it is with ourselves. The music which we are told produced such wonderful effects upon them, working them up to religious ecstasy, firing their soldiers with courage, melting them to tears, was of the crudest character, hardly worthy of the name of art. In spite of all that has been written by the Greek philosophers on the moral influence of music, it is doubtful whether they had any thought of what we should call æsthetic appreciation of the art, and were not rather referring to its sensuous or symbolic side. But while the influence of music upon the feelings is more obvious and pronounced in the case of the lower types of music, where the physical effects of sound and rhythm are chiefly relied on, that does not mean that as we ascend the scale the emotional appeal of music necessarily becomes less. Some writers would have us believe that emotional susceptibility and æsthetic appreciation on the part of the listener stand more or less in inverse ratio to one another. I do not believe

that. Certainly as we ascend the scale the purely physical effects of the music and the direct excitation of the nervous system become less pronounced. But something else takes their place. Though the music does not produce such palpable effects, it goes home to the heart and whispers its message of joy or sadness or peace no less potently. The feelings of the man of culture are as strong and sincere as those of the savage, though he does not wear his heart upon his sleeve and give such direct external expression to them. And in like manner a cultured musician listening to some great masterpiece may have his feelings far more deeply stirred than the man whose body is swaying about to the rhythm of a stirring march.

And now to give practical application to these thoughts, how do they affect the question of the kind of music suitable for use in religious worship? They warn us of the danger that attends the making the excitation of feeling the supreme standard in the selection of music for use in worship. It may be that it is because it stirs the feelings that music is of service in divine worship; but it does not follow that all music that has this effect is worthy of admission, or that the more pronounced and rousing its action, the better is it fitted for use in this connexion. That may have been the case in the lower stages of religion and among primitive peoples, whose conception of worship was the performance of certain external rites and who gauged the sincerity

of feeling by the exuberance of its manifestation. But with ourselves who realise that God is Spirit and that worship in spirit is alone what avails in His sight, it is different. The music best suited for worship in our religion is not that which produces the most violent excitation of the feelings, due in great measure perhaps to its purely physical effect upon our nervous system, but that which speaks home with most direct appeal to the heart. In a word it behoves us to see that we do not apply a purely quantitative standard when we consider the effect of music upon the feelings as a justification of its admission into Church worship, but rather a qualitative one, taking into consideration how it makes such appeal and what is the nature of the feelings it arouses.

As to how it makes this appeal, the higher we rise in the scale of artistic excellence, the more does the element of æsthetic appreciation enter into account as a factor. I do not believe, as I have said, that due æsthetic appreciation on the part of the cultured hearer diminishes the effect which the music has upon his feelings. Of course if we are to believe that æsthetic appreciation is entirely a matter of the intellect, and that the cultured hearer derives from the performance of the music only the kind of intellectual satisfaction that the mathematician has in following out the solution of some intricate problem, that might well be so. But the musical knowledge that the trained musician brings

to the hearing of the music does not take all the life and soul out of it and convert it into a mechanical compound of crotchets and quavers, of subjects and counter-subjects and the like, any more than a knowledge of grammar transforms purple patches of literature into an arid waste of nouns and verbs. Æsthetic appreciation of music is far removed from pedantic interest in the technicalities of the art. The cultured musician is keenly alive to the poetry and emotional appeal of the music to which he listens. A recent writer [1] would have us believe that "music as an art has no business with the conveying of emotions, and that it is the hallmark of bad music, as of base art generally, that it is emotional." Consequently he thinks that a listener of the professorial type, who looks in any composition for the syntax and grammar, is on the whole "less dangerous than the emotional listener, who really misses all that distinguishes music from any other art." [2] But I cannot believe that we are doing such vital injury to music by giving due value to its emotional appeal. It does not mean, as I have already suggested, that we dismiss all æsthetic standards and elevate feeling to the office of arbiter. But it seems futile to disregard the appeal which music does make to the emotions, and to dismiss in this superior fashion any reference to its power in this respect as unworthy of consideration.

[1] Turner, *Music and Life*, p. 7. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

The great composers are not ashamed to avow their susceptibility to the emotional appeal of music. They listen with the trained ear and the cultured mind, but that only makes them the more responsive to the message which the music whispers to the heart. After hearing Mendelssohn playing one of Bach's Organ Chorale Preludes, "Schmücke dich," Schumann wrote to him: "Round the *cantus firmus* hung golden garlands of leaves, and such blissfulness was breathed from within it, that you yourself avowed that if life was bereft of all hope and faith, this one chorale could renew them for you. I was silent and went away dazed into God's acre, feeling acutely pained that I could lay no flower on his urn." [1] That does not look as if æsthetic appreciation had diminished the influence of music on the feelings. One would rather say the reverse. It is just because Mendelssohn and Schumann were such cultured musicians that they were able to enter so thoroughly into the significance of the music, and felt so strongly the appeal that it made to the emotions. The less cultured musician might not find it fraught with such a deep spiritual message and might prove less responsive to its emotional appeal. And this brings me to the practical point that I wish to suggest. The higher the type of music, the more does it call for a certain amount of culture upon the part of the hearers to carry home its message to the heart.

[1] Schumann, *Musik und Musiker*, i. 153.

This should serve as a warning to beware lest we make the music we introduce into our Church worship too elaborate and difficult of appreciation. The portion of the musical service I have in my mind is that to which the congregation stand in the rôle of listener. When they are expected to perform, it goes without saying that nothing elaborate can be attempted. But when they are playing the part of listener, it is well to remember that what is aimed at is the making the performance of this piece of music an integral part of the devotion of the congregation, and that, in order that this result ensue, a certain co-operation on their part in the way of musical appreciation is essential. By all means let us make the anthems which we have performed at our Church services—for this is the item of Church praise to which my present remarks apply—as high class from the musical point of view as possible. There is a rich field of noble, truly devotional music upon which to draw. But let us realise that the musical taste of the congregation requires to be educated, and endeavour to carry them along in the effort to raise the standard of excellence, remembering that if we leave them merely agape at what they consider a show-off by the choir, the anthem has failed of its object just as surely as if we had moved them to tears by a piece of maudlin sentimentality.

Further as to the nature of the feelings aroused, while it is largely in virtue of its appeal to the feelings

that music secures a place in Church worship, it is a mistake to imagine that all music that makes such appeal is worthy of admission into our services. Feeling is after all a very variable criterion. If there are some feelings that are "deeper than all thought," some so profound that they are stirred only by music that seems to penetrate to the very inmost recesses of the heart, there are others that are sensual and shallow, that flow at the merest tickling of the ears. There is plenty of cheap music of this kind available, and it is matter for regret that it should sometimes find a place in our Church worship. The piece of shallow sentimentality, the cloying, sugary concoction fit to "draw three souls out of one weaver" that is sometimes offered as an organ voluntary, is unworthy a place in the service of the sanctuary. Of course it makes a certain appeal, but its influence never penetrates to any depth. "The tickl'd ears no heart-felt raptures raise." Even those who are carried away by it at first must, one would think, become nauseated in course of time. One has but to compare it with music inspired with the true devotional spirit to realise the impropriety, the positive indecency, of introducing anything of the kind into divine worship. It is as much out of place as a merry-andrew at a funeral.

But we may go further and say that not even all music that appeals to our religious feeling is to be admitted to divine worship. It is true that there is

a place, and an important place, for feeling in religion. A religious service in which our feelings are not engaged would certainly fail of its object. But while we recognise the value of feeling in religion, we are also alive to the danger of a shallow emotionalism. It is not enough that our feelings be touched for the moment, and that we are borne along on a passing wave of pity or anger or aspiration. Feeling that does not translate itself into action is of no value in religion. Dickens has exhibited to us the man who is the pure creature of feeling in Harold Skimpole. He is all sentiment, all susceptibility and sensibility ; but when poor Jo is received into the house sick and shivering, he takes nothing to do with the arrangements for his comfort, but occupies himself in playing snatches of pathetic airs and singing to them with great expression and feeling. When the others who have been looking after the boy join him, "he said he would give us a little ballad, which had come into his head, 'apropos of our young friend ;' and he sang one about a Peasant boy—

> 'Thrown on the wide world, doom'd to wander and roam,
> Bereft of his parents, bereft of his home,'

quite exquisitely. It was a song that always made him cry, he told us." That is the kind of emotionalism we do not want in religion. And anything in the musical way that ministers to it should be eschewed. Now one can distinguish between

music which has a purely emotional effect and music which penetrates deeper and exercises an influence upon the will. Mr. Wallace, indeed, seems to challenge our right to make any such distinction: "There is no man living," he says,[1] "who can speak of the ethical significance of music, nay, not even his children's grandchildren will have the faculty to do so. . . . No one can arrive at the 'ethical significance' of any kind of music until all that we to-day call music has been swept out of existence. We are only paving the way: we are at the stage of the cave-dweller with his tusk of ivory scratched with his flint. When sound has been resolved into tones, which, with our ever progressing cerebral development, will convey a definite impression to the brain, and when *that* kind of music has entered into close and intimate association with reason—when, ages hence, this occurs, it will be time enough to talk of the ethical significance of music." [2] But pending that time I do not see why we should not speak of the ethical significance of such music as we have—presuming that it does exert any influence of a moral character—even though it be destined in time to be swept out of existence by music of the more advanced character Mr. Wallace

[1] *Threshold of Music*, p. 198 f.

[2] Similarly Sir W. Hadow says: "It is the one art in which no human being can raise the false issue of a direct ethical influence" (*Studies in Modern Music*).

contemplates. Now there is a kind of music which has the same kind of influence upon the hearer as the emotional preacher. It melts the heart and stirs the feelings, dissolves us into sorrow or joy or pity for the time being, but does not exert any influence upon the will, and consequently passes away without leaving any permanent effect. Among the dangers which attend the employment of music in religious worship, the tendency to exploit it in the interest of emotionalism is a very serious one, and one against which we need to be on our guard. The Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the place of Music in the Worship of the Church (1922) has some wise words on the subject, which I cannot do better than quote:[1] "Emotionalism is a serious danger. In regard to preaching this is generally recognised to be the case; and the sensible listener is on his guard against it in the sermon. But he is, as a rule, not equally so in the music. Yet the two are alike; and both must be subjected to the same practical test. The congregation that goes home fired by either music or sermon to fresh effort has gained something valuable; but the congregation that has merely had one sensation the more, devoid of any definite outcome, goes away weakened in its power to make any good effort, and less capable in the future of effective reaction to genuine religious stimulus."

[1] P. 10.

Among the feelings which it should be the aim of our Church music to excite, first place must be given to devotion. Whatever other feelings may inspire the worshipper as he takes part in the service, a sense of awe and reverence as in the presence of the divine holiness should never be absent. It is one of the peculiar qualifications of music for employment in divine worship that it can inspire this feeling. It can create an atmosphere which fills the worshipper with solemn and reverent thoughts, and makes him feel that the house of prayer into which he has entered is a holy place, where it behoves him to set aside all worldly and unworthy thoughts and seek to enter into communion with God.

> There let the pealing organ blow,
> To the full-voiced quire below,
> In service high and anthems clear,
> As may with sweetness, through mine ear,
> Dissolve me into ecstasies,
> And bring all Heaven before mine eyes.

There is a kind of music which seems peculiarly fitted to fulfil this function. Mendelssohn said of Bach's music that it turned every room in which it was performed into a church. That is the kind of music we wish to have in our church services, music that has a dignity and gravity about it in keeping with the sacred place in which it is performed, music that seems to greet us with a solemn Hush! as we enter the sanctuary: "*Procul o, procul este, profani*"; "This is none other but the house of

God, and this is the gate of heaven." How much of the ecclesiastical flavour that attaches to music of this class is due to association, it is difficult to say. There is much music of the highest excellence, possessed of equal gravity and dignity, which yet seems to lack that odour of sanctity which attaches to the music I am referring to. Mr. Turner [1] takes a different view, and is "all against the idea that there is a special criterion for Church music. There is only one criterion," he says, "good music remains good music and bad remains bad, and the Church will always pull its reformers back into the abyss of bad music while it permits its members to ask, Is this appropriate? instead of: Is this good enough?" But there is much good music which we should hesitate to accept as suitable for use in Church. It may be all a matter of association. The music which has the Church ring about it may arouse feelings of devotion because that is the kind of music we have been accustomed to hear in church. Be that as it may, there is a kind of music which seems to us peculiarly appropriate to divine worship, calculated, to use Burns's phrase, to "beet the heav'nward flame" in the hearts of the worshippers, music which wakens in us solemn and reverent thoughts and wafts our souls to a purer atmosphere. That is the kind of music worthy to be introduced into divine worship. And whatever music has the

[1] *Music and Life*, p. 205.

opposite tendency, the tendency not to convert every room into a church but to convert the church into a concert-room, or picture-house, or dancing-saloon, whether by its inherent character or by force of association, that is the kind of music that we should endeavour to banish from our churches as dishonouring to the God to whom it is offered, and degrading to the worshipper who offers it.

As it is the function of music in Church worship at once to excite in the worshippers feelings suitable to the situation and to serve as a channel whereby they may give expression to their own feelings, we naturally look to find the music employed for this purpose adapting itself to the different types of feeling which it is designed either to excite or to express. Of course it is only within certain limits that music can represent feeling. It cannot discriminate between the finer shades or represent the definite content of any particular feeling. As Schopenhauer puts it, it does not express any particular joys or sorrows, but joy or sorrow itself, the real inner nature of the feeling in question. But within these limits music can excite or express the feelings; and in the music employed in our Church worship there will be broad distinction between the various types of music called into use, corresponding to the different types of feeling. Now, just as there are the two fundamental moods of feeling, joy and sorrow, so there are in modern music two distinct modes, the major and the minor, corresponding

thereto. Of course this statement must be taken subject to much modification. Not all music in the major mode is cheerful, or in the minor the reverse. The "Dead March in Saul" is one of the most sombre pieces of music in existence, yet it is in the major mode; and one can recall many pieces in the minor mode, e.g., "Prepare thyself, Zion," in Bach's Christmas Oratorio, which are as bright as if they were in the major. But generally speaking the major and the minor modes do correspond to the broad division of human emotions, and the difference between them is of service in helping to define the mood we are seeking to express in the music.

The point I wish to emphasise now is the desirability of having a certain congruity between the music and the words or acts associated with it in our worship. There are occasions on which one feels that there is some lack in this respect. Sometimes the devotional spirit to which I have referred is absent, and we feel that however good the music may be, it still lacks the religious atmosphere which pervades the words to which it is adapted, and tinges the joy or sorrow they express with a peculiar hue. Sometimes there is a sentimentality about the music that seems sadly out of place in a religious service, sometimes an appalling lack of dignity and restraint, sometimes a bright note in the music where we should have expected sadness or a grave melody where we desire something bright and cheerful. Due allowance must be made, of course, for

difference of taste, for the influence of tradition, and for other circumstances that may go far to account for what to us seems incongruous. One does not feel, for instance, that the tune Coleshill, which it is traditional in many parts of Scotland to sing to the Psalm of thanksgiving at the close of the Communion Service, is the type of tune we should select at the present day for joyful thanksgiving. Yet it commended itself to our forefathers for this purpose, and to ourselves, who have been so long accustomed to hear it sung on this solemn occasion, it has by association acquired a peculiar sense of fitness. Again when we think of some of the tunes used in the old Psalters as proper tunes for certain Psalms, we have the feeling that our forefathers must have listened to tunes in the minor or Dorian modes with different feelings from what these modes now inspire in ourselves, for they adapt them to words of a brighter mood than these modes suggest to ourselves. Or again there are such cases as I referred to in my first lecture of great composers using the same melodies to suggest feelings of the most contrasted character. These considerations urge us to be careful, and to beware lest we dogmatise too rashly on the incongruity between any piece of music and the sentiment expressed in the word or action to which it corresponds. But after all, while we pay due respect to the authority of tradition, and yield ourselves captive to the spell which the great composer by his manner of treat-

ment may cast upon us, it is our own feelings that have to be consulted in the use made of music in Church worship, and we have the right to demand that on the whole the standard of congruity be one in consonance with present-day standards.

One note which we should expect to find specially prominent in our Church music is the note of joy. One cannot fail to be struck by the frequency of this note in the Psalms. The Hebrew conception of the worship of Jehovah was that it was a cheerful thing. The songs of the temple were the outpourings of the exuberant joy that filled the heart of the worshippers :—

> O come, let us sing unto the Lord :
> Let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation ;

—that was the spirit in which they approached the temple. When the singer is pining in exile for the worship of the sanctuary, the picture that rises to his mind is that of a festive procession going up with shouts of joy to the holy place :—

> These things I remember, and pour out my soul within me,
> How I went with the throng, and led them to the house of God,
> With the voice of joy and praise, a multitude keeping holyday. —Psalm xlii. 4, R.V.

I do not think that this note of joy receives such emphasis in our Church music as it should. If one takes up a hymnal and goes through it looking for such tunes as at once create this impression of joyfulness, it is

remarkable how few there are. But if the Hebrew religion could inspire such a feeling, how much more the Christian! Surely it is time that we put away the notion that God likes to see His children making themselves miserable, that the worship of God's house is an obligation laid upon us to be performed with a sort of sullen devotion, and that the only music befitting divine service is that which reflects the gloom which we associate with the very thought of religion. Haydn was once asked why his Church music was so cheerful. He replied: "When I think upon God, my heart is so full of joy that the notes dance and leap, as it were, from my pen; and since God has given me a cheerful heart, it will be pardoned me that I serve Him with a cheerful spirit." "Rejoice in the Lord alway: and again I say, Rejoice"—that is the spirit our religion should inspire. It should send us on our way through the world with joy in our hearts and a song on our lips. And the praise of the sanctuary should strike the same joyful note. There should be a brightness and cheerfulness about it that we too often look for in vain. "Is any merry," says St. James, "let him sing psalms;" but one does not think of the average psalm or hymn tune as the kind of music in which one would naturally express mirth, unless on the ground that we take our pleasures sadly. Of course we can understand the reasons for the absence of the note of cheerfulness in much of our Church music. It is probably due to fear lest anything

be done to detract from the spirit of solemnity felt to be proper to religious worship. All through its history the Church has been alive to the danger of allowing its music to infringe the decorum of divine worship. Music was no monopoly of the Church, and its use in connexion with the theatre and the dance made the religious authorities, as I said in my last lecture, careful lest it should bring any of the contamination of these associations into the worship of the Church. Undoubtedly it is somewhat difficult to combine a spirit of joyful exultation with the gravity befitting divine worship, and much of the music in vogue in a certain type of religious service warns us that the desire to secure brightness may result in a boisterous vulgarity offensive alike to musical taste and religious decorum. But that the combination is not impossible is proved by such tunes as Darwall's 148th and *Lasst uns erfreuen*. There is no doubt about the note of joyful exultation in those tunes, yet they never do violence to the dignity and reverence befitting religious worship. One feels that we might with advantage have more tunes of this type in our hymnals. There is too much tendency to fancy that all tunes to be used in religious service must march along with the same stately tread. Many of the variations in rhythm of some of the older tunes have been lengthened out or cut short to fit the Procrustean bed of the recognised metres in vogue. This procedure is sometimes defended on the ground that the congregation find difficulty in

accommodating themselves to these irregular rhythms. But if our forefathers succeeded with them, there is no reason why they should prove impracticable to us, and I think it is time that the "ironing out" of all the rhythmical variations of our old Church tunes should cease. I am zealous for the preservation of the note of reverence and devotion about our Church music. But I am alive to the danger of carrying this tendency too far, and of damping down the natural ebullition of human feeling. And I contend that one of the things that we have a right to demand in our Church music is that it be music that does express what we actually feel, not what the Church authorities think we ought to feel, music with the note of true joyfulness about it, suited for use by those who, with joy and gratitude welling up within their heart, long to sing to the Lord with cheerful voice.

One of the characteristics of music that I noted as accounting for its use in Church worship was its social nature, and this suggests some features which we look for in our Church music. It is specially in connexion with the congregational praise that this characteristic of music comes into play. Joining together in the song of praise which they raise to their Father in heaven, the individual units of which the congregation is composed realise more forcibly their mutual relationship and dependence. Thus the common song is the sensible expression of the feeling of solidarity which animates the congregation, and

becomes elevated to one of the great symbols of religion. What is the kind of music suited for it? Some characteristics at once suggest themselves. It must not be too elaborate or difficult. We cannot look for much musical skill on the part of our congregations; and if we really expect them to join in the singing, then we must choose music of such simple character as to make no great demands upon their musical ability. There should be a clear distinction made in the arrangement of our Church music between the music for the congregation and that for the choir. The latter should be on an entirely different musical level from the former. It should be distinctly understood that it is reserved for the choir alone. There are some churches where the congregation seem to think that they should join in the singing of the anthem. But that is strongly to be deprecated. Only a small proportion of the congregation have the requisite musical skill to take part, and the result of a comparatively small number of singers scattered all over the Church—a soprano here, a bass there, and so on—striking in with hesitancy, and in many cases with doubtful tunefulness and purity of tone, can only be to mar the performance of the choir, and to prevent their attempting those niceties of expression which would only bring into bolder relief the lumbering effort of the congregation to co-operate. No, the anthem should be reserved for the choir alone, and they are justified in viewing with disfavour any attempt of the

congregation to participate. But equally are the congregation justified in resenting any attempt on the part of the choir to monopolise the whole of the praise, and to exclude them from participation in that department in which they are qualified to join. There are some who deny the right of the congregation to take part in the praise, and would relegate it entirely to the choir. "Why is the whole congregation to sing," asks Dr. Burney,[1] "any more than preach, or read prayers? . . . *Singing* implies not only a tuneable *voice*, but *skill* in music: for music either is or is not an *Art*, or something which nature and instinct do not supply; if it be allowed that title, study, practice, and experience may at least be as necessary to its attainment as to that of a mechanical trade or calling. *Every* member of a conventicle, however it may abound with cordwainers and taylors, would not pretend to make a shoe or a suit of cloaths; and yet in our churches *all* are to sing." There is a certain force in these arguments, and they bear out what I have just been saying as to the impropriety of any attempt on the part of the congregation to join in the performance of any of the more elaborate music admitted into our Church worship. That is a work of art, and calls for the artistic skill to which Burney refers. But all music is not at this high level. The folk-songs in which the soul of the people expresses

[1] *History of Music*, iii. 64.

itself, the lullaby with which the mother hushes her babe to sleep, the chorus with which the convivial company make the rafters ring—are we to silence these because the performers have not qualified in any musical school? So long as men find music a natural outlet for their feelings, so long will the congregation be justified in claiming a right to join in the song of praise or of penitence which forms an integral part of their worship. And if they are to do this, the music must be within their capacity and suited to their taste. It must be popular in the best sense of the term. One hesitates to advance such a criterion, for what outrages in our Church music have not been condoned in the name of popularity! The vulgar rant with its jingling refrain—"the right butter-woman's rank to market"—the roistering chorus, the drivel of cheap sentiment and emotional gush—how often are they defended on the ground of popularity! But I have a firmer trust in the popular taste than to believe that it actually demands and finds enjoyment in such things. It takes them in lieu of something better; but that it has the taste for something better is shown, in the secular sphere, by the folk-song which has entwined itself round the hearts of the people and secured a lasting hold on their affections, while the cheap music-hall ditties which have their passing popularity are soon utterly forgotten; and in the sacred sphere by the hold which our Scottish Psalm tunes or some of the great hymn tunes of the Church

have gained upon the heart of the people, compared to which the so-called popularity of some of the revival melodies seems a thing of naught. No, we need not be afraid of popularity if we know how to secure it. The outrages on musical taste which have been perpetrated in its name will not have been altogether to the bad if they awaken the Church to the instinct that is seeking satisfaction in this perverted form, and convince it of the need of providing something worthy. After all it is the feelings of the people which should be finding expression in our congregational praise, the feelings of the people themselves, not of the comparatively few experts who think to determine what form this expression should take. The people wish to sing. They have shown us, in the instances I have referred to, that they can give musical expression to their feelings in a worthy manner. One might almost lay it down as an axiom that all folk-music is good. Our aim in our Church praise should be to give the people the best types of that kind of music in which their own instinct prompts them to give expression to their feelings. "If we are pedants," says Dr. Pearcy Dearmer,[1] "we shall give the people what we imagine they ought to like; but if we are artists, we shall give them, not the idiotic melodies of the music hall or the vaporisings of the cathedral organist, but what they like best of all—their own

[1] *The Art of Public Worship*, p. 85.

true and healthy expression in song. Then, *if we help them to sing*, instead of hindering them, the time will soon come when the people will think how jolly it is to be in church, and will be looking forward all the week to next Sunday's music."

It goes without saying that if this is the kind of music we are to give the people, one indispensable feature about it will be melody. Stevenson says in one of his essays that "the true business of literature is with narrative." [1] With equal justice we may maintain that the true business of music is with melody. Certainly that is the feeling of the ordinary man. Whatever the critics may say, whatever amorphic productions our modern composers may evolve to create an atmosphere without any definite content, the plain man still hankers after something with a tune. It is a demand we must attempt to satisfy in the material we provide for congregational praise. Sometimes the compilers of our hymn-books seem to have been more concerned about harmony than about melody. But the harmony is a secondary consideration. It concerns only the choir and the organ. What the bulk of the congregation is interested in is the melody, the "people's part," as it used to be called in the old psalters. And it is no bad test of the worth of a melody if it can stand alone without any harmony to buttress it up. That is the kind of music we require for our congregational

[1] "Thoreau."

praise, and one is glad to notice in recent hymnals a tendency to give that prominence to melody which is essential if we are to make our Church praise truly popular.

In my first lecture I referred to the power of association which music possesses, and this suggests some considerations with regard to the kind of music used in Church worship which it is well to keep in mind. Association is a double-edged weapon; and if it serves to inspire a sense of fitness with regard to some music which has a distinctly ecclesiastical flavour about it, it acts as a drawback to the employment of some other music which brings with it a distinctly secular atmosphere. It plainly excludes whatever suggests the theatre or the dancing-saloon; but that is a distinct gain, for there should never be the desire to admit music of that kind into our Church service. But it raises a difficulty with regard to the introduction of music of the popular character to which I have just been referring. There is much good popular music not so markedly secular as to be unfitted for admission to divine worship, yet which has, for those who know it in its original setting, associations which make its use unbecoming. The hard and fast line which we draw between the sacred and the secular in music has not much justification in history. According to an eminent authority,[1] "the oldest Catholic

[1] August Gevaert, *Der Ursprung des römischen Kirchengesangs.*

Church music was transplanted into the Church from the pagan streets." At the time of the Reformation secular sources were freely drawn upon for music for the chorales. Luther thought that the devil should not have all the good tunes to himself, and adapted some of the street and drinking songs of the day to sacred words. Sometimes the devil got his own back, and the melody which Luther had thought to appropriate to the Church still resounded in the tavern and dancing-room. But sometimes he gained his end, and melodies originally of a purely secular character became the property of the Church, and sound in our ears to-day as profoundly sacred as could well be conceived. Think of such tunes as the Passion Chorale and Innsbruck. Who would ever suspect that they were originally secular airs? As Schweitzer [1] says: "Age confers on all music a dignity that gives it a touch of religious elevation. A mystic bond embraces and unites antiquity and religion; one clever writer maintains, not without reason, that we could mislead all the purists of Church music by putting before them an old secular motet with an accompanying sacred text." These considerations make us chary of resisting the introduction of popular airs into our Church services merely on the ground that they are secular. The good folk-song is not so markedly different in character from music suited for congregational use that

[1] *J. S. Bach*, i. 18.

there is any incongruity in admitting its use in Church worship. It is the associations that cling to it that cause the difficulty. When these are strong and generally familiar, then the propriety of making the transference may well be questioned. But there is much of our folk-music which has passed out of currency and is now merely traditional, of which the original association is known only to the antiquarian. One could mention cases of hymns being set in recent hymnals to traditional melodies where, if the original setting were recalled, the new adaptation might seem somewhat incongruous. But where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise. The number of those who are likely to be offended is very small; and in course of time those tunes may become so firmly wedded to the words with which they are now associated, that future generations may learn with surprise, as we do of the Passion Chorale, that they were originally secular in character. Where the secular association of any popular air is strong, then it is unwise to think of introducing it into Church worship. But where the air has passed out of general use, there seems no reason why, if it have the necessary dignity and merit, it should be denied admission to our Church praise on the ground of an association which does not exist save for the expert in folk-song.

One other requirement we may make of our Church music, that it be the best of its kind. Our praise is an offering to Almighty God; and how dare we

offer Him anything but the best? Already under the Jewish dispensation it had been realised that the song of praise might become a fitting substitute for the animal sacrifices that were laid upon the altar :—

> I will praise the name of God with a song,
> And will magnify him with thanksgiving.
> And it shall please the Lord better than an ox,
> Or a bullock that hath horns and hoofs.
> —Psalm lxix. 30 f. R.V.

We recall the strictures of the prophet Malachi on the conduct of his contemporaries in offering blemished sacrifices to God. The test which he proposes might be recommended with regard to much of our Church music : " Offer it now unto thy governor ; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person ? saith the Lord of hosts " (i. 8). Would they think of offering to their Persian governor the offerings which they lay upon the divine altar ? In the same way we may ask about much of our Church music : Is it of the quality we should require, were it to be performed before some earthly dignitary ? Nay, is it even on a level with the music we provide for our own entertainment ? Surely nothing but the best is worthy of presentation as our sacrifice of praise. " But sith the Prophet David," says Hooker,[1] speaking of the architecture and adornment of churches, " doth mention a natural conveniency which such kind of bounteous expenses have, as

[1] *Eccles. Polity*, v. 15, 4.

well for that we do thereby give unto God a testimony of our cheerful affection which thinketh nothing too dear to be bestowed about the furniture of his service; as also because it serveth to the world for a witness of his almightiness, whom we outwardly honour with the chiefest of outward things, as being of all things himself incomparably the greatest. Besides, were it not also strange, if God should have made such store of glorious creatures on earth, and leave them all to be consumed in secular vanity, allowing none but the baser sort to be employed in his own service? To set forth the majesty of kings his vicegerents in this world, the most gorgeous and rare treasures which the world hath are procured. We think belike that he will accept what the meanest of them would disdain." We should grudge no labour or care necessary to make our offering worthy, in the spirit of David of old: "Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which doth cost me nothing" (2 Sam. xxiv. 24). It is not creditable that the music of our concert rooms should be better in quality than that of our churches.

> Shall we serve heaven
> With less respect than we do minister
> To our gross selves?

When I say that our Church music should be the best of its kind, I am not pleading for any elaboration of our musical service. Some of the worst of our

Church music is due to the attempt to render something quite beyond the power of the performers. The plain, unambitious music of a little country church may be musically as excellent in quality, and therefore as worthy of being presented as an offering to God, as the elaborate cathedral service. What the character of the musical service is to be, whether of utmost simplicity or on a more ambitious scale, with some portion of it left to the performance of the choir, depends on the circumstances of the case. What I contend for is that the praise should be the best possible in the circumstances, in respect both of the character of the music selected and the manner of its performance. However unpretentious the music, it should be solid and dignified in character, free from the emotional gush and cheap sentiment which disfigure so much so-called sacred music, music with a strength and virility about it that make it popular in the best sense of the word. If it be music of a more ambitious character, such as can be performed by the choir alone, let it be music of genuine, solid worth; dignified, reverent, fit to be presented as an offering to God, and calculated to inspire feelings of deep devotion in the congregation. There is a wide and rich field to choose from, and there can be no justification for the admission of what is unworthy on the score of lack of material. And as we should seek for the best in our choice of music, so likewise in the performance of it we should be satisfied with nothing but the

best possible, the best on the part of the organist and choir, the best on the part of the congregation. How that best is to be secured calls for the most careful consideration of all who have the ordering of the praise in our churches. But whatever the procedure adopted, there must be no doubt about the standard: nothing but the best possible is worthy to be presented to God.

LECTURE III.

PSALMODY.

In the previous lectures I have been dealing with abstract questions. I now turn to the concrete, and examine some of the forms that music has assumed when enlisted in the service of the Church. Two alternative methods of procedure have suggested themselves to me, the historical and what I may call the topical. Under the former the history of Church music would engage our attention as matter of interest in itself; we should go back to the earliest times and endeavour to show from what humble beginnings it arose, what were the influences that contributed to its development, and how the various forms which it has assumed in the course of that development came to be evolved. Under the latter method we should start from the opposite end, and taking the various forms with which we are familiar as the things that specially concern us here, would touch on the historical conditions under which they have been evolved only in so far as they may help to cast light on their character and function. It seems to me that for our purpose the

latter method is to be preferred. The history of Church music would require much more detailed treatment than is possible within the scope of these lectures, and a much more intimate knowledge of the subject than I possess. There is abundant provision made in the text-books on the subject for those who wish to make a special study of it. Our interest in it here, I take it, is of a more practical character. We are concerned with the history of the subject only in so far as it may help us to understand and appreciate the inheritance handed down to us. So I propose that instead of taking the subject of Church music as a whole and endeavouring to give a connected account of its historical development, we should treat the various sides of it each by itself, and dip into history only in so far as it may help us better to understand their significance and possibilities. If we adopt this method and concentrate upon the forms of Church music which are of special interest to ourselves, that means, of course, that we shall leave unconsidered certain forms of Church music, such as the music of the Mass, which have played an important part in the evolution of Church music and would certainly fall to be dealt with in any purely historical inquiry, but which, as no longer forming part of our Church service, do not come within the scope of the present lectures.

Proceeding on this method, then, let us start with the musical use of the Psalter, which is certainly

one of the most characteristic features of Church music from the time of the Jewish temple to the present day. It is not easy to estimate the indebtedness of Christianity to Judaism. The roots of the new religion run down deep into Jewish soil. But perhaps the most precious inheritance that the Christian Church has received from Judaism is the Psalter, which touches some of the tenderest chords in the human heart and has become by general consent the treasury of song for the Church. No book of the Bible, not even the Gospels themselves, has taken such hold of the heart and so woven itself into the life of man. It makes universal appeal, for it touches the deepest instincts of our nature and ministers to its most pressing needs. Its theme is the converse of the soul with God; and in the presence of Him who has searched and known us, the inmost secrets of the heart are laid bare and the deepest feelings poured forth with such frankness, that, as Athanasius says, "the Psalms are to him who sings them as a mirror, wherein he may see himself and the motions of his soul." They sound the deepest feelings of the heart and give utterance to its most passionate yearnings. The book ranges over the whole gamut of human emotion. Joy and sorrow, hope and despair, doubt and trustfulness, anxiety and confidence, chase one another across its pages like the shadows of the clouds upon the hills. "Where," asks Luther,[1] "will you find words more

[1] Preface to the Psalter.

aptly chosen to express joy, than in the Psalms of praise and the Psalms of thanksgiving? There thou mayest look into the heart of all the saints, as into fair delightful gardens, yea, even into heaven itself, and note with what wonderful variety there spring up therein, like so many exquisite, hearty, delightful flowers, sweet and gladsome thoughts of God and His benefits. On the other hand, where canst thou find deeper, sadder, more lamentable words of sorrow than are to be found in the Psalms of complaint? There again thou mayest look into the heart of all the saints, as into death, yea, as into hell. How dark and gloomy it is there with the manifold hiding of God's countenance! So likewise when the Psalms speak of fear or hope, they speak in such manner of words that no painter could so paint the fear or the hope, and no Cicero or master of oratory could express them to the life more happily." In our deepest religious experience the words of the Psalms rise to our lips as the most fitting expression of the feelings. It was in the words of a Psalm that the Saviour uttered that cry of despair that was wrung from Him as He hung upon the cross, in the words of a Psalm that He committed His soul to God as He gave up the ghost. And throughout the ages the Psalter has supplied the language in which saint and sinner, gentle and simple, the learned theologian and the unlettered peasant have found most appropriate expression for their religious feelings. Men who have been the bitterest enemies

in life have died with the same words of the Psalter on their lips. Churches which are most widely divided in doctrine or government agree in the place of honour they assign to the Psalms. Of all the resources which the Holy Catholic Church has at its disposal, there is none which has in a more marked degree the property of catholicity than the Psalter.

In proceeding to discuss the part that the Psalter has played in the worship of the Church, let us go back to the source from which it sprung, and consider the use that was made of it in the Jewish Church. The information at our disposal is, unfortunately, very scanty, and much must be left to conjecture based on internal evidence. What makes the situation peculiarly irritating is that the inscriptions of the Psalms in many cases supply liturgical or musical directions which, if we could interpret them, would doubtless throw considerable light upon the Jewish practice; but unfortunately these directions are usually so obscure, and the interpretations of the authorities so divergent, that no reliable conclusions can be drawn from them. They remain, as Ewald says, "as scattered Sibylline leaves out of the lost book of old Hebrew music."

While the Psalter has been adopted by the Christian Church for use in public worship, it is questionable whether the book as a whole was originally designed for such a purpose. We must beware of transporting our ideas back to earlier times, and identifying the

use made of the Psalter in the Christian Church with its original purpose. As Duhm [1] points out to those who regard the Psalter as "the song-book of the congregation," there was no congregation to sing the Psalms in the temple as a Protestant congregation sings its chorales. And he is of opinion that the aim of the editors of the Psalter was rather to prepare a religious handbook which, while assisting the laity in the performance of their part of the temple worship, would serve likewise and more specially as a manual of devotion and religious edification. Be that as it may, we must recognise that there are some portions of the Psalter which seem fitted for private use rather than public worship :—

> Let my prayer be set forth as incense before thee ;
> The lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice ;
> —Psalm cxli. 2, R.V.

—that is evidently the utterance of private devotion which feels that the sacrifice of the lips is no less acceptable to God than the offering laid upon the altar. Some Psalms are meant to be sung in the privacy of the home during the watches of the night (e.g., cxlix., 5) ; some are prayers so intimate and personal in character that they seem designed not for liturgical use but for private devotion by the "still in the land ;" others, such as the 119th or the alphabetical Psalms, appear to be framed for didactic purposes.

[1] *Psalmen*, p. xxiv.

But if there be some portions of the Psalter which seem intended for private devotion, there are others which are plainly designed for use in public worship. Sometimes the heading indicates the liturgical use to which the Psalm is put. For instance Psalm c. has the heading : A Psalm for the Thank-offering ; Psalm xcii. : A Song for the Sabbath Day ; and Psalm xxx. : A Song at the Dedication of the house of David. There is nothing, indeed, in the last Psalm, which is a song of deliverance from grave danger, to indicate that it was composed for the special occasion indicated by the heading ; but it may very well be that the Psalm was used at such a religious celebration after some period of great national danger, such for instance as threatened under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. But the indications as to the liturgical use of the Psalms supplied by the headings are comparatively few in number. More instructive is the light shed upon the subject by the evidence of the Psalms themselves. Let me direct attention to some of the conclusions we may draw along these lines.

Plainly some of the Psalms are meant to be used in the sacred processions which were a feature of the Jewish ritual. The law recognised three great feasts, the Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles, and it is a significant fact that the Hebrew word for Feast originally meant a procession. In the religious procession the people went up, with the priest at their head and to the

accompaniment of music and song, to the temple—in early times, perhaps, carrying the ark of Jehovah just as their heathen neighbours used to carry the images of their gods—and marched round the altar joining in the sacred dance. Many of the Psalms bring this religious procession before our eyes. So in Psalm lxviii. :—

> They see Thy processions, Yahweh, into the sanctuary.
> The singers go before ; behind the musicians ;
> In the midst damsels playing on timbrels.
> —v. 24, Briggs's transl.

Again the latter part of Psalm xxiv. evidently points to the bringing of the ark into the sanctuary—we do not know for what purpose it had been taken away—or it may go back even to the original bringing up of the ark to Jerusalem, in which case the "ancient doors" will refer to the gates of the city, not of the temple. In Psalm xlviii. we have a description of a procession through Jerusalem, probably by a company of Jews of the Dispersion who have come up to Jerusalem for some Feast. The Psalm is to be conceived as sung in the temple (v. 9) before the procession begins ; then the company march forth to compass Jerusalem, to mark her bulwarks and her palaces, and note the beauty and strength of the city of which they have heard and which they have now the joy of seeing. As I have said dancing played an important part in the religious procession, and there is occasional reference to

it in the Psalms (e.g., cxviii. 27 [Baethgen's trans.]; cxlix. 3; cl. 4). Closely akin to the Procession Psalms are the so-called Pilgrim Psalms, cxx.-cxxxiv., called in the titles of the Authorised Version, Songs of Degrees. There is some difference of opinion among scholars as to what is meant by this heading. One commonly received explanation is that it means "Songs of Pilgrimage," i.e., songs sung by pilgrims going up to the Feasts.

In addition to the Procession and Pilgrim Psalms there were likewise Psalms for use at the great religious and national festivals. In many cases these too may have been sung in procession as the people marched up to the temple to celebrate the festival in question. There were Passover Psalms, Feast of Tabernacles Psalms, Psalms to celebrate outstanding events in national history, Psalms of victory, and so on. In a people of such deep religious feeling as Israel, it is only to be expected that that sense of dependence upon God, which is such an outstanding feature of their religion, should find occasion for supplication or thanksgiving in all the varied experiences of life. When Hezekiah received the insulting letter from Sennacherib, we read that he went up to the house of the Lord and spread it before the Lord (Is. xxxvii. 14). It is characteristic of the spirit of the Jewish religion. It takes the daily experiences of life, its trials and its sorrows, its joys and its blessings, up to the house of the Lord, and spreads them before the Lord. Consequently

we find in the Psalter a faithful reflection of the life of the people. They pour forth their sorrows before God, they plead with Him to deliver them from their affliction, they praise Him for victory vouchsafed over their enemies, they thank Him for the daily mercies bestowed upon them. They mingle their songs with the thank-offerings which they bring into the house of the Lord (Jer. xxxiii. 11). We may well believe that the Psalter must have contributed in no small measure to that spiritualising of religion which reaches its culmination in Christianity. Originally the sacrifice was the all-important thing, the song of praise which accompanied it a mere adjunct. But in course of time more and more emphasis came to be laid upon the "sacrifice of the lips," until at last when the Master came He could speak of the temple not as the place of sacrifice but as the house of prayer.

The music of the temple was in the hands of a special class of singers and musicians belonging to the order of Levites. According to the Talmud female voices were not admitted to the temple service. It is unlikely that the body of the people participated to any large extent in the praise. In the Procession Psalms we may perhaps conceive them joining in the song as they marched round the altar; but for the most part their contribution would be confined to occasional responses to the song of the choir, such as Amen, Hallelujah, or the refrain in Psalm cxviii.: "Because His mercy endureth

for ever." The singing of the choir would in all probability be antiphonal in character, whether as between a soloist and the choir as a whole, or between different sections of the choir. In view of the parallelism of Hebrew poetry it seems natural to suppose that if the Psalms were sung antiphonally, the alternation would be between the two halves of the verse rather than verse by verse. But while this seems the reasonable proceeding, the main *raison d'être* indeed of antiphonal chant, we cannot be certain that it was so ; and modern Jewish practice, I believe, bears witness to the opposite effect, the alternation being by the verse not the half-verse.

The stringed instruments used in the temple orchestra were chiefly the *kinnor* and the *nebel* (the lyre and the harp). According to a verse in Isaiah and the express testimony of the Talmud, flutes were likewise employed. Trumpets were also introduced on occasion, and were blown by the priests. Cymbals were employed to mark the beat. The orchestra accompanied the singing, and added occasional preludes and interludes. The mysterious symbol Selah, which the LXX translates διάψαλμα, is usually taken nowadays as a musical direction to the orchestra to strike in with louder music in an instrumental interlude. We have no reason to believe that the Hebrews had any knowledge of harmony ; so we have to imagine the accompaniment of the instruments as a mere duplication of the melody sung by the choir.

We are unfortunately quite in ignorance of the character of the music used for the Psalms. It must have been something of the nature of a chant, to suit the varying length of the verses. There are some who think to trace back the Gregorian tones to the music used by the Hebrews in their temple worship. There is no evidence, indeed, upon which to base any such deduction ; but we can well believe that the Hebrew chant, designed for the same purpose as the Gregorian, may have been somewhat similar in character. Some of the headings of the Psalms refer to what seem to be titles of songs, e.g., " Hind of the dawn " (Ps. xxii.), " The dove of the distant terebinths " (Ps. lvi. with change of reading) ; and it is possible that they point to the employment of some melody or mode associated with the songs known by these titles, just as Burns puts at the head of some of his songs the name of the tunes to which he had written the words. It is probable that if we could hear the strains of the temple music, we should be rather disappointed, and marvel at the appeal made to the Hebrew by music which sounds to us uncouth and repellent. But we must not judge by our modern standards. Whatever we might think of it, there is no question but that it went home to the heart of the pious Jew. It came to him laden with tenderest memories, enhanced by the solemnity of the impressive ceremonial with which it was associated, endeared by sacred traditions reaching far back through many vicissitudes of fortune to the

most glorious times of the national history; and we can well believe that in virtue of these hallowed associations its appeal was as direct and powerful as the most finished products of modern art, or the familiar melodies of the old Psalm tunes which have so warm a place in our affections.

From the Jewish Church the Psalter passed over to the Christian. That the Jewish Christians should prize and make abundant use of it, is only what is to be expected; and the Gentiles who were received into the Church would likewise be initiated into its use, and made familiar with its contents. At first when the infant Church was subject to persecution, the meetings of the Christians had to be held in secret. But in course of time the need for secrecy passed, and the Psalms were sung with boldness, a demonstration and a challenge to the world around. "Throughout the whole world," says Eusebius,[1] "in towns and villages and in the fields also, in short, in the whole Church, the people of Christ, who are gathered from all nations, sing to the one God, whom the prophets foretold, hymns and psalms with a loud voice, so that the voice of the psalm-singers is heard by those standing outside." The Psalms were particularly used at vigils as a means of keeping the congregation attentive. Certain Psalms were assigned to special occasions, e.g., the 63rd: "O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee," to

[1] *Ad Psalm*, 65.

the morning service; the 141st: "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice," to the evening; the 22nd to Good Friday. In public worship the Psalms were intercalated between the Lessons, which some think the reason of their being called Responsory Psalms, because they answered the Lessons. This sounds rather a fanciful explanation of the title. It seems more reasonable to attribute it to the manner of performance, to which I shall refer presently. In monastic establishments the Psalms were in constant use, a considerable number being sung one after the other. We hear of a peculiar custom which obtained in some cases of proportioning the number of Psalms sung to the number of the canonical hour, singing six at the sixth hour and ten at the tenth. In the daily life of the people the Psalms were in constant use. Tertullian [1] urges Christian husbands and wives to emulate one another in Psalm-singing. It was, as we learn from another Father, the custom to sing them before and after meals, and before going to sleep. In fact the Psalms were in such continual use that they became woven into the very texture of the life. "If the faithful are keeping vigil in the church," says Chrysostom,[2] "David is first, middle, and last. If at dawn anyone wishes to sing hymns, David is first, middle, and last. At funeral processions and burials, David is first,

[1] *Ad uxor.*, II, 8.

[2] *Hom.*, 6, *de pœnit.*

middle, and last. In the holy monasteries, among the ranks of the heavenly warriors, David is first, middle, and last. In the convents of virgins, who are imitators of Mary, David is first, middle, and last." It soon became a custom to learn the Psalter by heart. "Never let the book disappear from thy hand or thy sight," says Jerome [1] to a monk, "thou must learn the psalms word for word by heart." One of the Councils of the Church even went the length of making a knowledge of the Psalter an indispensable condition in the consecration of a bishop.

As to the manner of rendering the Psalms a variety of methods existed. Sometimes the performance was left to the precentor, the congregation striking in from time to time with a refrain such as in Psalm cxxxvi.: "For His mercy endureth for ever," or with some exclamations such as Amen, Alleluia, *Gloria Patri et Filio*. This seems the most natural explanation of the term "Responsory" as applied to certain Psalms. As a general rule the response of the congregation consisted of the same refrain repeated time and again; but occasionally they responded to the precentor with alternate verses. In the congregational contribution to the Psalmody the whole body of the people participated. There was doubt in the minds of some as to the propriety of allowing women to join in, in view of the injunction of the Apostle that they should keep silence, and some

[1] *Patr. Lat.*, xxii. 1078.

went the length of prohibiting it. But generally it was permitted. "Women and men," says Chrysostom,[1] "old men and children differ in sex and age, but they differ not in the harmony of singing hymns; for the Spirit tempers all their voices together, making melody of them all."

In course of time when choirs were introduced, the antiphonal method of performance was adopted. This consisted in two choirs chanting alternate verses. Tradition assigns the innovation to Ignatius, who had a vision of the angels so singing to the Holy Trinity. But in view of the existence of the practice in the Jewish Church, no such supernatural explanation is required. The antiphonal method of chanting was introduced into the West by Ambrose, who took the opportunity afforded by his faithful flock being shut up with him in church, at the time of his persecution by the Empress Justina, to instruct them in this method of singing.

With the development of music in the Church certain elaborations were made in the performance of the Psalms. It had been the custom to sing a short solo-melody before the Psalm to make the singers familiar with the tune. This developed in course of time into the practice of singing to the melody of the Psalm some words from another source, designed to enforce the meaning of the text of the Psalm. This was called the Antiphon, and

[1] *Hom.*, 36.

it was repeated from time to time in the course of the performance of the Psalm. Another elaboration was the expansion of the Alleluia into a jubilant melody of "linked sweetness long drawn out." As Augustine[1] says: "It is a song of joy without words: it is the voice of a heart dissolved in joy, which tries as far as possible to express the feeling, even if it does not understand the meaning." This *jubilus*, as it was called, gave scope to the musical powers of the singers.

In the rendering of the Psalms no instrumental music was employed, probably because of the worldly association suggested by such. "We sing God's praise," says Eusebius,[2] "with living psaltery, inspired cithara, and spiritual songs. For more pleasant and dear to God than any instrument is the harmony of the whole Christian people, when in all the churches of Christ we sing psalms and hymns with harmonious minds and well-tuned hearts." The music employed was the liturgical chant of the Latin Church, which came to be known by the name of Gregorian Chant. Its distinguishing characteristics were its use of the ancient modes and its rhythmical freedom. A word or two of explanation on these points may perhaps be serviceable. Our modern music uses—or at least did use until quite recently, when revolutionary experiments in the way of tonality have been made by present-day

[1] *In Psalm.* 99. [2] *In Psalm.* 91.

composers—only two modes, the major and the minor, and the various scales in use are really only repetitions of these two modes at different pitch. The scale is composed of tones and semi-tones; and what constitutes the distinct character of the mode, major or minor, is the place where these tones and semi-tones occur. Since the seventeenth century the major and minor modes have been firmly established; and so familiar have they become, so strange does any departure from them sound in our ears, that we are apt to fancy that they are due to some natural law. But that is not so. These modes are not the only ones that have been employed, and among the Greeks certain other modes, i.e., arrangements of the place of the tone and semi-tone in the scale, were in general use, and it is these that are employed in the Gregorian Chant. Originally there were only four such modes employed, introduced by Ambrose about the end of the fourth century and called Authentic Modes. Two centuries later Gregory added four other modes which were called Plagal, the distinction being that whereas in the Authentic Mode the range of the melody was from the key-note, called the Final, to the octave above, as e.g., in "The Blue-bells of Scotland," in the Plagal Mode this keynote was midway between the two extremes of the scale, and the melody was partly above and partly below it, as e.g., in "Ye Banks and Braes." The different place of the semi-tone in the old modes gives them a distinct character and colouring. Each

of these different modes had its own chant or tone as it was called. The structure of the tone was as follows. It consisted of two parts, corresponding to the two halves of the verse. Each part contained a reciting note, which was followed in the first half by a cadence called the Mediation, in the second half by another cadence called the Final. There were different forms of these endings for some of the tones, which lent variety. The first strain was preceded by a few notes called the Intonation, which was sung only at the first verse of the Psalm.

The other distinctive feature of the Gregorian Chant is its freedom of rhythm. The notes of the Mediation and the Final are not written in any fixed time. They have no accent of their own, but take whatever accent suits the words. The music, in short, has the freedom of the rhythm of prose, and is consequently able to adapt itself to the varying accent of the words of the Psalm. Another feature of the Gregorian Chant is that it is sung in unison or the octave. At the time of its introduction, harmony was as yet an undiscovered art.

Gregorian Chant held the field till after the Reformation. In England it encountered a formidable rival in the shape of the Anglican Chant, which has for the most part succeeded in displacing it. Historically the Anglican Chant is a development of the Gregorian, and some of the earliest examples were little more than adaptations of Gregorian melodies. Gregorian Chants were in general use in

England till well on in the seventeenth century, and it was not till the time of the Restoration that the Anglican Chant came into favour. Its characteristics are its abandonment of the ancient modes; its wider range and more interesting type of melody; its harmonic structure; and its fixity of rhythm, the chant, with the exception of the reciting note, being written in strict time, to which the words have to accommodate themselves. Originally the Anglican Chant was, like the Gregorian, a single one, to be sung to one verse. But in course of time it was expanded into the double chant, which provided music for two verses, and both single and double chants are now in common use. Some of the Anglican chants, particularly the older ones, are admirable, chaste, and reverent in character, and with something of the same ecclesiastical tone about them as we associate with the Gregorian. But others, particularly those of a later date, lack the gravity and decorum which we look for in Church music.

It would be rash to attempt to adjudicate between these two rival systems of chanting. Each has its warm supporters, who have strong things to say about the opposite method. For the Gregorian Chant it is claimed that it has a distinct ecclesiastical flavour about it which is often sadly lacking in the Anglican; that it is reverent in spirit; that it is easily singable by the congregation; that it is faithful to the principle that must ever guide us in all questions

of Church music, in that it subordinates the music to the words and makes the liturgical factor the supreme consideration.[1] If it be charged with monotony in view of the poverty of its melodic content, it can reply with a similar objection to the monotony of the Anglican Chant in respect of its harmony. The upholders of the Anglican Chant regard the Gregorian as an interesting historical relic which it is idle to attempt to restore to general use. They protest that it is foolish to refuse to take advantage of the richer resources of modern music, simply because another style was perforce in existence before these resources had been revealed. They declare that we cannot put back the hands of the clock, and that it is absurd to imagine that the uncouth and monotonous strains of a bygone era will ever commend themselves to an age which breathes an entirely different musical atmosphere. It is a difficult subject—not as yet a vital one for us in the Church of Scotland, where the question is rather as to getting the chanting of the Psalms introduced at all, than as to the form of chanting, Gregorian or Anglican, to be adopted.

It is matter for regret, I think, that the Psalter is not more largely used in our worship in Scotland

[1] Cp. A. S. Duncan-Jones, *Church Music*, p. vii: "Church music should not be sought in the *Encyclopædia* as a sub-heading of the article on Music, but rather under the letter L as a department of Liturgy. For that is its proper place."

than it is. So far as the metrical Psalms are concerned, of which I shall speak presently, we have reason to be satisfied at the hold they have gained on the affection of the people. To a certain extent they have, of course, been ousted from the unique place they once held by the introduction of hymns. But though they do not now constitute the whole of the praise at public worship, they still hold a worthy place, and there is little fear, I believe, that the Scottish people will abandon their allegiance to them. But it is mainly for the music to which they are sung that the metrical Psalms are held in such esteem in our Scottish worship. However high we may rank them—and there is a rugged strength and homeliness about them that speak to the heart—no one will seriously contend that they are anything but a feeble substitute for the sonorous language of the prose version.[1] Even if we were to sing them

[1] "It is very certain that the Hebrew poetry cannot be rendered into English verse without robbing it of its very peculiar beauties—its terseness, the force of its expressions, the peculiar antithetic construction of the sentences, most of the excellencies, in fact, on which its power of impressing the heart and adhering to the memory depend. Little or none of those solemn, thrilling feelings of respect and awe, which are produced by reading a sublime passage of the Psalms or Prophets in the common version, would be felt if the same passage were turned into metre and rhyme. Who that reads a Psalm for devotion or instruction, ever reads it in Brady and Tate? In order to render the words metrical, and to make the lines correspond with the original,

all through, we should still miss much by knowing the Psalms only in the metrical version. And of course we are very far from singing them all through. We use only snippets of them, singing from four to eight verses at a time. On the musical side this is one of the most satisfactory features of the service, because the tunes, to which the metrical Psalms are sung, are among the choicest gems of our Church psalmody. But as a serious attempt to take advantage of the treasury of sacred song placed within our reach by the Psalter, it is lamentably inadequate. Is it not right that we should make more generous use of this veritable mine of devotion than we do? "What is there necessary for man to know," asks Hooker,[1] "which the Psalms are not able to teach? They are to beginners an easy and familiar introduction, a mighty augmentation of all virtue and knowledge in such as are entered before, a strong confirmation to the most perfect among others. . . . Let there be any grief or disease incident into the soul of man, any wound or sickness named, for which there is not in this treasure-house a present comfortable remedy at all times ready to be found. Hereof it is that we covet to make the Psalms

expressions require to be lengthened out and diluted, till they have lost their terseness and vigour; others to be added, which have not authority from the original, but merely help to fill up the line" (*Popular Tract on Church Music*, by Robert Druitt, 1845, p. 24 f.).

[1] *Eccles. Polity*, v. 37 (2).

especially familiar unto all. This is the very cause why we iterate the Psalms oftener than any other part of Scripture besides; the cause whereof we inure the people together with their minister, and not the minister alone to read them as other parts of Scripture he doth." All who are zealous of God's house will likewise "covet to make the Psalms specially familiar unto all." We lose much by not gaining that intimate acquaintance with the beautiful language of the Psalter that comes from hearing the Psalms iterated at our public worship. Chanting is not really a difficult matter, being really, as Hullah said, "a species rather of musical elocution than of music," and any choir worthy of the name that seriously addresses itself to the task should succeed in attaining sufficient proficiency. With the congregation it may be another matter. If they are to participate, it is essential that they have a pointed text. Even with that it may take some time, when the chanting of the Psalms is an innovation, before they acquire sufficient confidence to join in with heartiness. But even if the congregation do not take part audibly, they can join in the spirit. As Chrysostom says:[1] "It is possible to sing without the voice, if the understanding gives echo." While I am jealous of any attempt to deprive the congregation of their participation, in the praise of the sanctuary, I believe that even if this part of the

[1] *In Psalm.* 41.

worship has to be left in great measure to the choir alone, what we gain by having the prose Psalms made a regular feature of our public worship far more than compensates for what is lost by relegating another of the items of praise to the choir.

But if there be any doubt upon this point, the inclusion of the prose Psalms may still be retained and the participation of the congregation secured by having the Psalms read instead of chanted. One wonders that this method is not more generally practised. Perhaps the shyness of our Scottish congregations to take any vocal part in the service except in the singing may account for it. But one can believe that any diffidence on the part of the congregation would soon disappear. The reading of the Psalms might be divided between minister and congregation, the minister reading the first half of the verse and the congregation responding with the second half. This seems the proper method of alternation, though as a general rule when antiphonal chanting is practised the alternation is by the verse not by the half-verse. All arguments for antiphony of this kind based upon the parallelism of Hebrew poetry seem beside the point, for the parallelism in Hebrew poetry is between the half-verses, not between the verses. It was by the half-verse that Mendelssohn [1] heard the Psalms sung in

[1] *Letters*, 16 June, 1831.

Holy Week in Rome, and this is the plan adopted in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford, and St. John's College, Cambridge. Just as we have our Psalters pointed for chanting, so we might have them arranged for such antiphonal reading between minister and congregation as I am referring to. Something of the kind would be necessary if the whole Psalter were to be brought into use ; for while as a general rule the parallelism of Hebrew poetry runs by the half-verse, there are frequent cases where other varieties of structure are introduced, and one can well conceive how useful a Psalter arranged for such alternate reading as I am urging would prove. Whatever the method adopted, chanting or alternate reading, it is in the highest degree desirable that in our Scottish churches a worthier place be assigned to the Psalter than is secured by the rendering of one or two portions of the metrical Psalms.

But let us turn now to consider the part which the metrical version of the Psalms has played in the worship of the Church. The practice of singing metrical versions of the Psalms originated in France, where the version of Marot attained great popularity at the court of Francis I., who encouraged the poet in the work of translation and to whom the book was dedicated. Marot was not himself a Protestant, but being suspected of heresy he fled to Geneva; and though the singing of his metrical Psalms may not at first have been distinctively Protestant, it soon

became so, and the term psalm-singer came to be a synonym for Protestant. The book was adopted by the Genevan Church, and Calvin himself prepared a preface for the edition issued for use in that Church. Switzerland was the place of refuge for English and Scottish reformers during the religious persecutions at home; and when they returned to their own countries they introduced the practice of singing metrical versions of the Psalms which had gained such vogue upon the Continent. Luther had been keenly alive to the power of song as an instrument for the propagation of the truth, and he and his fellow workers in the Lutheran Church set themselves to the composition of hymns which should embody and stimulate the new spirit that was animating the Church. But in the Reformed Church a narrower spirit prevailed. Calvin would not admit original hymns. He restricted himself to the Psalms of David. They had, he thought, been dictated to him by the Holy Spirit, "and therefore," he declared, "when we sing them, we are as certain that God has put words into our mouths as if He Himself sang within us to exalt His glory." The only psalmody in the Genevan Church was a metrical rendering of the Psalms adapted to music of the simplest kind. This was the type of psalmody that the exiled reformers brought back to England and Scotland, and it soon attained great vogue. "Psalms," says Bishop Burnet, "were much sung by all who loved the Reformation; and it was a

sign by which men's affections to the work were measured, whether they used to sing them or not."

Various metrical versions of the Psalms were produced from time to time, and some secured a firm hold on popular affection. It would not be interesting to enumerate them all. I shall mention only one or two of the most important. In England the one which for a long time reigned supreme was Sternhold and Hopkins. Sternhold was groom of His Majesty's robes, and the story goes that as a boy of twelve King Edward VI. heard him singing his Psalms to the organ, and expressed his delight at the performance. It is rather a striking coincidence, as Hawkins [1] points out, that both in France and England the first metrical versions of the Psalms should have been by courtiers. As Marot dedicated his version to Francis I., so Sternhold dedicated his first edition (1545), which contained fifty-one Psalms, to Edward VI. Hawkins was a schoolmaster. He added another fifty-eight to the fifty-one Psalms of Sternhold. The remaining versions were the work of various hands. The first complete edition appeared in 1562. The Psalter was designed for use not only in church but likewise in private houses, in the hope that it might take the place of the frivolous and sometimes indecorous songs that were on the lips of the people, as set forth on the title

[1] *History of Music*, IV., chap. ix.

page of the 1560 edition: "Very mete to be used of all sorts of people privately for their godly solace and comfort, laying aparte all ungodly songes and ballades, which tende only to the nourishing of vice, and corrupting of youth." In respect of poetic merit it must be confessed that the Sternhold and Hopkins version has but little to recommend it. Fuller said of the versifiers that "their piety was better than their poetry, and they had drunk more of Jordan than of Helicon." And Campbell declared that they "with the best intentions and the worst taste, degraded the spirit of Hebrew psalmody by flat and homely phraseology, and, mistaking vulgarity for simplicity, turned into bathos what they found sublime." But it achieved great popularity. Crowds joined in the singing. The very roughness and uncouthness of the translation strengthened the directness of the appeal. In course of time the language of the versifiers came to acquire something of the sacredness of inspired Scripture in the eyes of the vulgar, and when a new version was introduced to take the place of the old, it encountered an enormous amount of prejudice. The new version which was proposed in place of Sternhold and Hopkins was by Tate and Brady. It was published in 1696. While it was admitted to be smoother and more elegant than the old, these very qualities were regarded as blemishes by those who had been enamoured of the crudities of Sternhold and Hopkins; and it had to run the gauntlet

of a very severe and prejudiced criticism, and never attained anything like the popularity of the old version.

One version of some interest was composed by Archbishop Parker during his exile. It was printed privately about 1560, but for some reason was never published. It is musically interesting because it contained nine tunes by Tallis composed in the different modes. Some of these are still in common use amongst us, e.g., the Psalm tune Tallis and the well-known Tallis canon. In the English Hymnal the First, Second, and Third Mode Melodies are also preserved. The Parker metrical version likewise contains a classification of the modes according to their emotional effect, which it may be interesting to reproduce:—

The Nature of the Eight Tunes.

1. The first is meeke: devout to see
2. The second sad: in majesty
3. The third doth rage: and roughly brayth
4. The fourth doth fawne: and flattry playth
5. The fifth deligth: and laugheth the more
6. The sixt bewayleth: it weepeth full sore
7. The seventh tredeth stoute: in frowar race
8. The eyghte goeth milde: in modest pace.

The 1562 edition of Sternhold and Hopkins was the first English Psalter published with music, but this was restricted to the melody. An edition with a four-part setting of the tunes was published by Day

in 1563. Sometimes two or three different settings of the same tune are provided by different composers, and in addition a considerable number of new tunes are added. Various musical editions were published from time to time, among the best known being those of Damon, 1591, Este, 1592, Ravenscroft, 1621, and Playford, 1671 and 1677. At first the melody was given to the tenor, as was the custom of the time. Damon's Psalter was published in two books, the second bearing the title: "The second Booke of the Musicke of M. William Damon, conteining all the tunes of David's Psalmes, differing from the former in respect that the highest part singeth the Church tune." This was the principle adopted in Playford's 1677 edition, in which the tunes were set in three parts with the melody at the top. Musically this edition was inferior to some of those that had preceded it. In many respects it is a concession to the limited abilities of the singers. Where the tune appears too elaborate, an alternative setting is given; where the metre of the version is peculiar, a second version in ordinary metre is provided. As Mr. Frere says in the introduction to the *Historical Edition of Hymns Ancient and Modern:* "He gauged his public well, and made sufficient sacrifices to save his cargo. His *Whole Book of Psalms* became the standard book for the whole of the rest of the seventeenth century, and the greater part of the eighteenth—almost as long, in fact, as the Old Version in any real degree held the field."

In Scotland, too, metrical Psalms were introduced by refugees returned from Geneva. John Knox was for some time pastor of the English congregation in Geneva, which used an Order of Service containing a selection of the Psalms in metre, fifty-one in number, each furnished with a tune. Of these fifty-one Psalms forty-four were by Sternhold and Hopkins, but considerably altered. This book would no doubt be brought over by the refugees on their return and used in public worship. The formal authorisation of a version of the Psalms by the General Assembly did not take place till 1564. Previous to this the Genevan Psalter had been increased from fifty-one first to sixty-five, and then to eighty-seven Psalms, and all these were included in the version approved by the Assembly of 1564. As we have seen, a considerable portion of the Genevan Psalter was based upon Sternhold and Hopkins. In its final form the Scottish Psalter differed from the English in forty-one versions of the Psalms, besides which the English had five duplicates not in the Scottish. As this 1564 version held the field, like Sternhold and Hopkins, for a long period, it may be of interest to give a detailed account of it. As has been said, it contained the whole eighty-seven Psalms in the Genevan collection. In addition there were forty-two from the recently published portion of the English Psalter—the complete Sternhold and Hopkins had appeared, as has been said, only in 1562—and twenty-one new contributions. One outstanding

feature of this version was the variety of metres employed. There were ninety-nine in C.M., eleven in L.M., and five in S.M., while for the thirty-five remaining Psalms there were no less than twenty-seven different kinds of metre. Many of these varieties of metre are imitations of the French, the tune being that to which the corresponding Psalm in the French version was set. In some of the subsequent editions of the Psalter, but not in the 1564 one, are included some so-called Spiritual Songs, i.e., metrical renderings of some portions of Scripture, such as the songs of Mary and Simeon, the Lord's Prayer, also the Creed and the Veni Creator. It is doubtful if these were ever used in public worship. An interesting feature which appeared in later editions was the printing of the prose version of the Psalms in the margin. The version of the text adopted for this purpose was that of the Genevan Bible, i.e., the Bible prepared and published at Geneva by the English exiles there. Curiously enough this version was retained for this purpose after the publication of the Authorised Version. The Aberdeen Psalter of 1633 was the first to adopt the Authorised Version for this marginal use. One edition of the Psalter (1595) has a full set of appropriate prayers, one for each Psalm, and also a set of so-called Conclusions. These Conclusions were doxologies, though not so called, and were intended to be sung at the close of the Psalm or portion of the Psalm that had been sung. As there was such

a number of different metres employed in this Psalter, it was necessary to have a corresponding number of Conclusions in like metres. How these prayers and Conclusions came to be introduced in this edition, we do not know. Probably it was due to some desire on the part of the promoters to conform to Episcopalian practices. The prayers were not included in any subsequent edition. The Conclusions likewise disappear in later editions, with the except on of that in common metre which is retained in the edition of 1635. A letter from Robert Baillie,[1] one of the delegates to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, indicates that the use of the Conclusions was abandoned in deference to the Puritanic spirit which animated the Conference : " Also about the Conclusion of the Psalme we [the Scottish Commissioners] had no debate with them [the English Divines] : without scruple Independents and all sang it, so far as I know, where it was printed at the end of two or three psalmes. But in the new translation of the Psalmes, resolving to keep punctuallie to the originall text, without any addition, we and they were content to omitt that whereupon we saw both the Popish and Prelaticall partie did so much dote, as to put it to the end of most of their lessons and all their psalmes."

It may be of interest to have a specimen of the prayers and Conclusions of which I have been speak-

[1] 25th April, 1645.

ing. Here is the prayer "upon" the 23rd Psalm: "Eternall and everlasting Father, fountaine of all felicitie: uue rander thee prayses and thanks for that thou hes declarit unto us our Pastour and defender quha sall delyuer us from the pouuer of our adversaries. Grant unto us that uue castand auuay all feir and terrour of deith, may embrace and confesse thy trueth, quhilk it hes plesit the to reueill to us by thy son our Lord and soueraigne Maister, Christ Jesus." Here is one of the Conclusions from the full set, that, viz., to Psalm lxxx. :—

To our Father bening,
That made us of nocht
To Christ our Lord and King,
from deith that us bocht,
And the halie Spreit
that faild us neuer:
Be glorie infinite
for nouu and for euer.

And here is the one to which Baillie is probably referring in his letter quoted above :—

Glorie to the Father, to the Son,
And to the holy Ghost,
As it was in the beginning,
Is now, and ay shall last.

It remains to speak of the music of this Psalter. As we have seen, the source from which it was derived was the Genevan Psalter of 1556, which

contained fifty-one Psalms, each with a tune of its own. Such tunes associated with particular Psalms are known as Proper Tunes. When the number of Psalms in the Genevan Psalter was increased, no new tunes were added, but in the case of the new Psalms a reference was given to the tune of another Psalm to which it might be sung. This was the practice adopted in the 1564 Psalter. The next step was the introduction of the Common Tune, i.e., a tune not associated with any particular Psalm but available for general use. The first edition fully harmonised was not published till 1635. Of this a reprint has been published, edited by the Rev. Neil Livingston, with much interesting material in the Dissertations and Notes; and as this edition supplies the best evidence for the state of music in the Church at this time, it may be of interest to give an account of it. It contains 104 Proper Tunes, thirty-one Common ones and eight in Reports. These last are tunes with a certain amount of *quasi* fugal treatment. We have still two in our present-day Psalters, Bon-Accord and Aberfeldy. Besides tunes in the major and minor modes, there are some in the old ecclesiastical modes, the Dorian, the Phrygian and the Mixo-Lydian. To speak of the Proper Tunes first, a very large number of these are what we call double, which seems to indicate that in these days the common metre stanza was regarded as consisting of four long lines of fourteen syllables, instead of four short lines as with us of 8686. There

is still evidence in our metrical Psalters of to-day of this having been the original structure of the stanza, the alternate short lines being printed without capitals at the beginning. Sometimes the adaptation of the tune to the words of the Psalm strikes us at first as rather incongruous, cheerful sentiments being associated with the minor or Dorian mode, and sad ones with the major. But perhaps we are rather prone in these days, when we have but the two modes, to make the line of demarcation between them too pronounced, and our classification of sentiments appropriate to either too peremptory. A closer examination of some of these old tunes proves to us that there are much subtler shades of difference within the limits of the various modes than are contemplated by our rough and ready classification. And when we take into account the difference that may be made by the manner of performance, the rate at which the tune is sung, the spirit in which it is rendered, whether plaintive or joyful, sprightly or dignified, we may come to realise that that incongruity which at first strikes us between the sentiment and the music is largely due to our ignorance or prejudice. We can say little definite as to the origin of these Proper Tunes. As we have seen, the nucleus of the Scottish Psalter was the collection in use in the English congregation in Geneva, and forty-two of the tunes from this Psalter were incorporated in the Scottish Psalter of 1564. Whence were these tunes in the Genevan Psalter

derived? We cannot say for certain. Some of them may have been taken from other collections, though we have not been able to trace them. But others were no doubt composed specially for this Psalter. And the same holds with regard to many of the additional tunes that were inserted later, when the size of the collection was increased. Some are taken from existing sources, English, French, and German—the tune of the 112th Psalm is that of the Chorale "Vater unser"—but others were probably composed for the purpose, and may be claimed as English or Scottish. Taken as a whole the Proper Tunes are a most interesting collection. Some are apt to be tedious owing to lack of character in the melody, but others are excellent examples of what congregational psalmody should be; and one is glad to notice a tendency in some of our modern hymnals to make fuller use of them. What could one want finer in the way of a hymn tune than the Old 107th? How is it that such a tune has been allowed to fall into neglect? One can easily understand how the Common Tune came to be introduced. The learning of so many tunes—a different one practically for each Psalm—must have been rather a severe strain upon the musical powers of the congregations. As we have seen, the expedient of using the Proper Tune of one Psalm for another one had been adopted when the size of the Genevan Psalter was increased. This was the thin end of the wedge; and in course of time certain tunes were introduced which were meant

not for any special Psalm but for use with any in the metre in which they were composed. These Common Tunes have come in course of time to oust the Proper ones from their supremacy, and to us nowadays, with our cut-leaf arrangement in our Psalters, the typical Psalm tune is the Common one. The Proper Tune had, of course, been known by the number of the Psalm for which it was written; but in order to distinguish the Common Tunes some system of nomenclature had to be devised. The practice adopted was to call the tunes after the names of places. It is a plausible conjecture that the selection of the name for any tune may have been made with some reference to its origin; and in this way some tunes, such as Dunfermline, Dundee, Cheshire, and Durham, may witness to a Scottish or English source. But even this clue, slight as it is, fails us when we meet with cases where the English and the Scottish Psalters differ as to the names, as e.g., Dundee, which is known in the English Psalter as Windsor, while the English gives the name Dundee to the tune we know as French. Some of the Common Tunes in the 1635 Psalter are among the best known and most firmly established in popular favour, e.g., French, York (called Stilt), Dunfermline, Dundee. Others are still retained in our books, but are not in such common use, and are in danger of falling into complete neglect unless care be taken to introduce them in our worship. I refer to such tunes as Culross, Cheshire, Elgin, Martyrs, the two latter

more familiar, I am afraid, to most Scotsmen in Burns's well-known lines [1] than by actual acquaintance with the melody. Others, such as the Old Common, English, Inverness, Jedburgh, Glaston, have been dropped from our Psalters altogether, and are quite unknown to most of us. The tunes in Reports are of interest, being the modicum of musical elaboration admitted into the psalmody of the Church of Scotland during a long period of its history. Tunes in Reports first appear in an Aberdeen Psalter in 1633, which contains two examples, one of which is still in use amongst us and bears the appropriate name of Bon-Accord. Sometimes the tune in Reports is the same as the Proper Tune of the Psalm, e.g., in the 113th and the 137th, at other times it is a different tune altogether. In no case is the fugal treatment of the melody by any means elaborate. But slight though it be, it is still sufficient to require some musical efficiency on the part of the performers; and if these tunes in Reports were used in public worship, there must, one would think, have been a choir to carry through the performance.

A word or two about the general arrangements for the Church music of this period. The melody

[1] Perhaps Dundee's wild warbling measures rise,
Or plaintive Martyrs, worthy of the name;
Or noble Elgin beets the heav'nward flame,
The sweetest far of Scotia's holy lays.
—"The Cotter's Saturday Night."

is given to the tenor, or Church part, as it is called. In the 1635 edition of which I have been speaking, the music is so printed that persons sitting on opposite sides of a table can read off the same book, tenor and contra being printed on a page which was upside down as compared with that of the treble and bass parts. The music was constructed on the principle of syllabic partition. The elaborate music of the Roman Catholic Church had tended to obscure the text for which the music was composed; and there was a strong feeling among the Reformers that music must be made thoroughly subservient to the Scriptural text which it was designed to enforce, but not to thrust aside. Cranmer had already, in his report to Henry VIII. upon translating the Liturgy into English, laid down the principle: "The song made thereunto should not be full of notes, but as much as may be for every syllable a note, so that it may be sung distinctly and devoutly." This was the principle adopted in the music for the metrical Psalms. The leader of the psalmody in worship was called "the uptaker of the Psalms." If there was a choir, it would probably be supplied by scholars from the Sang Schule, a relic of pre-Reformation times. In later times the practice of "lining out," as it was called, i.e., the precentor reading each line of the words before it was sung, was introduced. This was not really a Scottish custom at all, though it came to be regarded as such. It came from England where

it originated in consequence of the inability of the people to read, and was introduced into Scotland after the Westminster Assembly of 1643 in deference to the wishes of the English Divines. Psalm singing was fostered by the ecclesiastical authorities, and seems to have been a favourite recreation with the people. There must have been considerable musical proficiency among the body of the people to become acquainted with the large number of Proper Tunes in the Psalter. The historian tells us that on the return of Durie from temporary banishment he was met by a great crowd, which took up the 124th Psalm and sang it in four parts.

The 1564 Psalter held the field for a long time. Attempts were made to set it aside in place of the version by King James. But the acceptance of that version was bound up with the acceptance of Laud's Liturgy; and against this the Scottish Church rebelled. The version which was finally adopted in place of the 1564 Psalter was by Francis Rous, Provost of Eton. It was approved by the Westminster Assembly, 1643-49, and, after revision and amendment, by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1649, and published in 1650. This is the version that is still in use amongst us. It can lay no claim to outstanding poetic merit. It were easy to criticise it for its many defects, its pedestrian style, its halting metres, its uncouth rhymes. But it has secured a warm place in the affections of the

people, and we should be loath to change it for any other version that had more pretensions to poetic worth. Suggestions have been made from time to time to have a revision made; and the Presbyterian Church in Ireland has carried such a project through, the work having been done with very tender care. But in Scotland the proposal has met with no favour. In 1828, when the impression had got abroad that an alteration was contemplated, Sir Walter Scott wrote to the Convener of the General Assembly's Committee on Psalmody to the following effect—and his words express well what are the sentiments of the Scottish people regarding their metrical version: "The expression of the old metrical translation, though homely, is plain, forcible and intelligible, and very often possesses a rude sort of majesty which perhaps would be ill-exchanged for more eloquence. Their antiquity is also a circumstance striking to the imagination, and possessing a corresponding influence upon the feelings. They are the very words and accents of our early reformers —sung by them in woe and gratitude in the fields, in the churches, and on the scaffold. The parting with this very association of ideas is a serious loss to the cause of devotion, and scarce to be incurred without the certainty of corresponding advantages . . . I hope, therefore, they will be touched with a lenient hand."

The period which succeeded the adoption of the 1564 Psalter may be regarded as the golden age of

Scottish Psalmody. That which followed the introduction of the new Psalter saw it reach its lowest depth. The early enthusiasm of the Reformation and Covenanting periods had waned, the tendency in the Church was for men to become "settled on their lees." Musical arrangements in Church worship did not tend to the encouragement of congregational praise. It was, as we have seen, after the Westminster Assembly that the custom of "lining out" was introduced, and that inevitably had a deleterious effect upon the congregational singing. The precentor, in addition to reading out the line to be sung, had to lead the congregation in the tune. But precentors were not satisfied with confining themselves to the music before them. They sought to magnify their office, and it became the custom to adorn the notes of the tune with all sorts of grace notes or "quavers," as they were called. For instance, a writer in the eighteenth century tells us of a precentor who insisted that there should be eight quavers to the first note of Elgin. The consequence was that the congregation had great difficulty in discovering what the tune was that they were intended to sing. The Sang Schules had been discontinued, and there was no provision made for the musical instruction of the people. The old Pròper Tunes had been dropped, and of the Common ones only a limited number were in use. When an attempt was made in Aberdeen to increase the number, the Kirk Session passed a resolution for-

bidding their use in public worship, and appointing "their precentors to sing only in all time coming the twelve church tunes commonly sung in Scotland." Twelve church tunes—to such modest limits had the great wealth of Psalmody set before us in the 1635 Psalter been reduced! But in due course a movement for the improvement of Church psalmody took shape. It began in Aberdeenshire through the instrumentality of some English soldiers stationed there. They had made an impression by their manner of singing the Psalms, and their leader was induced to start a class. It proved a great success, and the choir which he gathered were invited to Aberdeen to give an exhibition. Enthusiasm was aroused. Aberdeen set to work to improve its psalmody. In course of time the movement spread to Edinburgh and Glasgow; singing schools were started which the congregations were exhorted to attend; and while the results were not all that might be desired, something was done to raise Scottish psalmody from the deplorable condition to which it had sunk.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, about the time when the florid style of hymn tune came into vogue in England, a new type of Psalm tune attained a certain measure of popularity in Scottish psalmody. It was evidently inspired by a desire to abate somewhat the severity and majesty of the older style of Psalm tune, and to introduce into our Scottish psalmody something of the vivacity and

brightness of the florid hymn tune which was finding favour in the sister country. The tunes of this period are more ornate than the old style of Psalm tune, depart from the note for syllable principle, and introduce occasional passages for two or three voices succeeded by repeated lines. They lack the dignity and massiveness of the old Psalm tunes; and while they gained vogue for a time, and succeeded in securing a place in contemporary collections, one is glad to note their disappearance from most modern Psalm books, though there are still some who deplore their loss and speak regretfully of the "old Scottish Psalm tunes"—a title to which they have no claim—which have been allowed to fall into desuetude. It is of them that Mr. Hately speaks in his preface to "The Psalmody of the Free Church of Scotland," published in 1845: "A spurious kind of Psalmody has been gradually introduced, which threatens to destroy the character and pervert the object of Church music. The grave simplicity of the Psalm has been exchanged for a light and florid—and often mean and vulgar—melody, garnished with the airs and graces of secular music, full of unmeaning iteration of words, solos, and responses, and all the tricks and devices resorted to in order to tickle the ear, and reduce the praise of God to an amusement. Not only are multitudes of such things composed every day, but even in Collections appearing under the auspices of distinguished musical names, we see, with indignation,

Psalm tunes made out of popular ballads, and even out of airs taken from the gayest and most profane productions of the Opera Stage. And to make room for trash of this sort, the fine old standard tunes are almost entirely excluded."

The introduction of hymns has naturally put an entirely different aspect upon the situation. The Psalms no longer hold the unique place they did in the worship of the Church. In place of being the sole material employed in our praise, they now take their place alongside of other forms which, as a general rule, largely preponderate in point of quantity in our service. But while we welcome the introduction of hymns into our worship, we do well to be jealous of the preservation of the metrical Psalms. Words and music alike are very dear to us. When our sons and daughters beyond the seas think with longing of the service in the church at home where they sat with their parents as children, it is for the sound of the good old Psalm tunes that their heart yearns. The metrical version that we use was made by an Englishman, and we cannot say anything with certainty as to the origin of the tunes. But words and tunes, wherever they have come from, we have now made them our own. They are among the most distinctive features of our Scottish Church worship, the most characteristically Scottish and at the same time the most musically effective. I would plead for their still being accorded a place of honour in our worship. They are dear to us by many

hallowed associations. Rugged and uncouth though the metrical version sometimes be, it speaks home to the heart of the Scotsman with a potency that a chaster poetic style might fail to rival. And the grand old tunes, to which the words are wedded, have a massiveness and dignity which make them stand out as models of what music for congregational praise should be. It is matter for regret that some of them are being allowed to fall into disuse. The cut-leaf system at present in use in our metrical Psalters is designed to realise the purpose of the Common Tune. But it has had the result of diminishing the number of tunes called into use ; and in many of our congregations the repertory of tunes in general use is approaching perilously near the scanty twelve which the Aberdeen Kirk Session enjoined its precentor not to exceed. One is gratified to notice that some modern English hymnals are drawing upon our Scottish Psalm tunes for adaptation to hymns. Martyrs, Wigton, Melrose, Cheshire—these, for instance, one finds in the English Hymnal. But how many of them are in use in our Scottish congregations ? It will not be creditable to us in Scotland if we allow our neighbours south of the Tweed to become more familiar than ourselves with tunes which figure in our Psalters, but which we are allowing to fall into neglect. And there is another respect in which the cut-leaf system seems open to objection. It leads to great lack of uniformity throughout the Church. The Common Tune has

not been an unmixed blessing. Sometimes a certain tune has become so closely associated with a certain Psalm as to become almost proper to it, as for instance French to the 121st. But for the most part there is little uniformity in the practice of different congregations; and one hears a Psalm sung to one tune in one church, to another in another. Would it not be desirable to try to establish association between certain tunes and certain Psalms, and to have a greater measure of uniformity prevailing throughout the Church? But whether that proposal be adopted or not, I plead for the use of a larger number of the Psalm tunes than at present enter into the repertory of many of our congregations, and for the rescue of many of the fine old tunes that are now in danger of falling into oblivion. We can make no pretension to any elaborate music in our Scottish Church service. But so long as we cherish our Psalm tunes and give them the place of honour in our worship, we have a something for which many Churches with more advanced musical resources at their disposal may still envy us. Let us see to it that we utilise to the full the precious legacy we have received.

LECTURE IV.

HYMNODY.

In turning now to consider the hymnody of the Church, let us, as in the previous lecture, make a rapid survey of the history of this department of Christian praise, marking the various streams which have combined to form this great river of song.

It is natural that the first believers, in the exuberance of their joy, should have burst into song. They were intoxicated with spiritual enthusiasm. They were like men raised from the dead. A new spirit had come into their life, and the exultation which filled their hearts found expression in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (Eph. v. 18 f.). And from these early days of Christianity, when the first believers in an ecstasy of joy stammered forth their song of thanksgiving, down to the present time, the strain of praise evoked by the sense of the divine mercy in Christ Jesus has been ever gaining in volume, till the Church has been enriched with a hymnody which she justly considers as among her most precious treasures.

Of the earliest Christian hymns we have, unfortu-

nately, but few specimens. Foremost among them are the Canticles preserved in the opening chapters of St. Luke, which have secured a firm hold on the heart of Christendom. Other examples are to be found in the odes of the Apocalypse, and, according to the opinion of many scholars, in certain passages of the Epistles which sound like fragments of hymns, e.g., Ephesians v. 14; 1 Timothy iii. 16; 2 Timothy ii. 11. The earliest external evidence upon which we can base is the well-known letter of Pliny, Governor of Bithynia, to the Emperor Trajan, in which he speaks of the Christians coming together before daylight and singing hymns alternately (*invicem*) to Christ as God. The *alternately* seems to point to antiphonal singing. But we would fain know something of the content of their song. Was it one of the Messianic Psalms, or a Christian hymn like, say, the song of Moses and the song of the lamb in the Apocalypse ?

In the early days of Christianity, the meetings for public worship were of a most informal character, and, as St. Paul tells us in his description of the worship at Corinth, each made such contribution as he pleased to the edification of the assembly, whether a doctrine, an interpretation, or a psalm. Such a psalm might be either an original composition or the reproduction of some familiar song of praise. But in course of time the freedom and spontaneity of the meetings of these early days gave place to an ordered system of worship. Certain Scriptures

were recognised as canonical, and these alone were admitted to use in public worship. It is probable that similar restrictions would be introduced with regard to the hymnody, and that certain songs would acquire a kind of canonical character. At any rate we find, in addition to the Canticles from St. Luke already mentioned, certain other hymns taken from or based on Scripture, which have a recognised place in the worship of the early Church. Among these may be mentioned the "*Gloria in Excelsis*," the "*Gloria Patri*," the "*Trisagion*" and the "*Te decet laus*." Of hymns of a less Scriptural cast that have come down to us from these early times, special mention may be made of Clement of Alexandria's στόμιον πώλων, "Bridle of colts untamed," the oldest Christian hymn in existence, of which somewhat free renderings are to be found in "Shepherd of tender youth," by Dr. Dexter and "Lead, holy Shepherd, lead us," by Dr. Macgill; and to φῶς ἱλαρόν, of which the authorship is uncertain, reproduced in Keble's "Hail, gladdening Light" and in Longfellow's "O gladsome Light" in "The Golden Legend," a hymn which throughout the centuries has retained its place as an evening hymn in the service of the Greek Church.

Fortunately the policy of confining the praise of the Church to the material supplied by Scripture was not maintained. But, as often happened to the Church in her history, it was to her enemies that she was originally indebted for the step which

was to prove of such advantage to herself. The Gnostics had realised the wisdom of seeking to spread their doctrines by embodying them in song. The Arians followed in their train, veiling, as Ephraim the Syrian said, the plague of destruction in the garment of musical beauty. The device was so successful that orthodoxy felt constrained to fight heresy with its own weapons; and it was this Ephraim who first adopted the plan of enshrining orthodox doctrines in homilies couched in poetical form and in hymns which might find a place in the hearts and minds of the people. He was followed by a train of imitators, and a large body of Syrian hymnody was the result. The Council of Laodicea (4th cent.), alive to the danger of the introduction of false doctrine into the worship of the Church, forbade the admission of anything into the Liturgy which was not taken from Holy Scripture, and restricted participation in the praise to the appointed singers "who mount the ambo and sing from the book." But it is doubtful if this prohibition was carried into effect. Certainly the popularity of hymn-singing outside of the Church was not affected, and we are told that at the time of Chrysostom the rival parties used to march in procession at night through Constantinople, singing hymns in which the doctrines to which they adhered were set forth. In consequence of the riots which followed, an imperial edict put an end to all public Arian singing. But the nocturnal hymn-singing, which had its origin on

this occasion, became an established practice in the Church. The hymns of the Eastern Church which have come down to us belong to a later period, dating from the seventh to the ninth centuries, which were the most productive periods in Greek hymnody. There is an enormous number of them in the office-books of the Greek Church. Dr. John Mason Neale has addressed himself to the task of making us in the West acquainted to some extent with the hymns of the Eastern Church; and all who are interested in hymnology will acknowledge the valuable service he has rendered in this respect. Withal our acquaintance with them is but slight, and only a comparatively small number have won their way to popularity. Among the most familiar we may mention Anatolius's "The day is past and over," John of Damascus's "The day of resurrection," and one of the most popular hymns in our collections, "Art thou weary?" which was originally published by Dr. Neale as a version of a hymn by Stephen, nephew of John of Damascus, but which has such slender connexion with the Greek text that it is rather to be ranked as an original hymn than a translation.

We turn now from the Eastern to the Western Church, and note the rise and progress of Latin hymnody. Two names stand out with special prominence at its beginning, those of Hilary of Poictiers and Ambrose of Milan. Hilary was one of the champions in the Arian controversy, "the

Hammer of the Arians" he was called. He was banished from his diocese and spent six years in exile in Phrygia. Here he would be made familiar with the practice of hymn singing, and on his return he introduced it in the West. He composed a book of hymns, none of which, however, has come down to us. He was ably seconded by Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who, when required to give up his church to the Arians, shut himself up in the building with his faithful flock, and beguiled the tedium of the siege by teaching the people to sing hymns. "Then it was first instituted," writes Augustine,[1] "that after the manner of the Eastern Churches, Hymns and Psalms should be sung, lest the people should wax faint through the tediousness of sorrow: and from that day to this the custom is retained, divers, yea, almost all Thy congregations, throughout other parts of the world, following therein." Ambrose had a great influence upon the hymnody of the Church, both as regards words and music; and his name has been given to a certain type of hymn which attained great vogue. It consists of eight stanzas of four lines each, written in iambic dimeters. There is difference of opinion as to the genuineness of some of the hymns that are ascribed to him, but there is a small number concerning which there is no doubt.[2]

[1] *Conf.*, ix. 7.

[2] There are four that are attested by Augustine: "*Æterne rerum conditor*," "*Deus creator omnium*," "*Jam surgit hora tertia*," "*Veni redemptor gentium*."

Among early Latin hymns one stands out pre-eminent, for it has become the great song of thanksgiving of the Church—the "*Te Deum.*" Its authorship is unknown. Some think it is based upon a Greek original. Others maintain that it is a purely Latin composition.[1] Whatever its authorship, we are justified in giving it a place among the earliest Latin hymns. By general consent it has become the recognised song of praise on any occasion of public or solemn thanksgiving.

As I have said, the movement for the introduction of hymns inaugurated by Hilary and Ambrose found much favour. Other writers followed in their train. Some of the notable names are Prudentius, a Spanish layman of the fourth century, who did not write hymns exactly, but rather poems from which hymns have been extracted; Sedulius, the author of an alphabetical poem on the life of Christ; and in the sixth century Pope Gregory the Great, whose name is associated with the system of tonality which was to dominate the plainsong of the Church, and Venantius Fortunatus, the author of two of the great hymns of the Passion: "*Vexilla Regis prodeunt,*" and "*Pange lingua gloriosi prælium certaminis.*"

During this, the first period of Latin hymnody,

[1] "To give you my opinion briefly, the *Te Deum,* equally with the Angelic Hymn (to which it is very similar in form and expression), was born in the Eastern Church, whence it has been translated into the Latin tongue" (H. A. Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus,* ii. 289).

the hymn-writers clung to the classic metres, of which they employed a considerable variety. But in course of time a new prosodial tendency began to assert itself. Instead of making metre depend entirely on the quantity of the vowels, the poets began to pay more attention to accent, and to make its recurrence at certain intervals the ruling principle in metre. And another innovation also began to find favour, the introduction of an assonance or rime at the end of the line. From the sixth century onwards these tendencies begin to assert themselves.

Hymns were generally used at first in the offices for the canonical hours, a cycle of hymns being drawn up for the different offices of the week, with special provision for the various ecclesiastical seasons, the commemoration of saints, etc. As we have seen the Council of Laodicea had prohibited the use of unscriptural hymns. But that attitude was the exception. Other Councils took a different view. The Council that deposed Paul of Samosata made it one of the grounds of its action that Paul had prohibited the use of uninspired hymns addressed to Christ. The Council of Toledo (633) censured the view that hymns not taken from Scripture were not to be permitted, and ordered the use of such hymns in Spanish churches under penalty of excommunication. But while the use of hymns was thus approved, they were not originally admitted to the service of the Mass, though there were occasional exceptions to this rule. The manner in

which they came to secure a place is interesting, as it explains the origin of a certain type of hymn, viz., the Sequence. It had become the custom to interpolate melodies of a more or less elaborate character at certain points of the service. These melodies, which were mostly from Byzantine sources, had no words assigned to them, but were sung to any vowel or convenient syllable, such, e.g., as the final *a* in Alleluia. In this way the Alleluia in the Mass was made the occasion of the introduction of a series of pieces of melody, each of which was sung through twice before going on to the next. This "song without words" gave occasion to various mystical explanations. To one it seemed as if the joy of the singer were too great to be put into words; to another it was a foretaste of that heavenly state in which we should no longer need to use words, for mind will hold intercourse with mind by thought alone. As the strings of melodies introduced were of considerable length and elaboration, it was no easy matter to remember them; and it occurred to a certain Notker, a monk of St. Gall, that it would be a good plan to have words written, syllable for note, as an aid to memory. He set himself therefore to make up certain rhythmical compositions which might be sung to the interpolated melodies; and these received the name *Sequence* because they followed after the Alleluia, or *Prose* because they were originally unmetrical in structure. The sequence thus established itself as a welcome addition to

hymnody, and in course of time all the existing melodies, which had been sung without words, were supplied with a suitable text. Thereafter new melodies were composed, associated with new words. But when this point was reached, it was natural that the text should again take precedence, and that instead of the words being written to the melody, the melody should be composed to suit the words. In these circumstances the necessity for the Sequence being unmetrical no longer existed, and it came to assume metrical form, always however retaining the characteristic feature that it was made up of pairs of strophes for which the music was repeated. One of the earliest of the Sequences in metrical form is the Golden Sequence: "*Veni, sancte Spiritus*" ("Come Thou Holy Paraclete"). Others that have still their place in modern hymn-books are the Alleluiatic Sequence: "*Cantemus cuncti melodum nunc Alleluia*" ("The strain upraise of joy and praise"), often ascribed to Notker, but probably by another inmate of St. Gall; "*Lætabundus*" ("Come rejoicing"); "*Victimae Paschali*" ("Christians, to the Paschal Victim"); and "*Salus aeterna, indeficiens*" ("Saviour eternal, health and life of the world"). But perhaps the most famous of all are the "*Dies Iræ*" by Thomas of Celano, and the "*Stabat mater dolorosa*," ascribed to Jacopone. The most distinguished Sequence writer was Adam of St. Victor, esteemed by Archbishop Trench and Dr. Neale as the greatest of the mediæval poets.

There are some other outstanding names in the Middle Ages worthy of mention for their contributions to Latin hymnody; Thomas Aquinas who wrote four sacramental hymns for the newly instituted festival of Corpus Christi, one of which, "*Pange lingua gloriosi corporis mysterium,*" was modelled on the "*Pange lingua*" of Fortunatus to which I have already referred; Bernard of Cluny, who wrote a long satiric poem "*De contemptu mundi,*" from which Dr. Neale has translated a cento of 218 lines, from portions of which "Jerusalem the golden" and the companion hymns have been made up. Another Bernard deserves mention, Bernard of Clairvaux, if he be indeed the author of the poem from which the hymns: "*Jesu dulcis memoria*" ("Jesus, the very thought of Thee"), "*Jesu dulcedo cordium*" ("Jesus, Thou joy of loving hearts"), and "*Jesu Rex admirabilis*" ("O Jesu, King most wonderful") are taken. His authorship is disputed. To whomever the poem is to be ascribed, it breathes a warmth of feeling and a passionate devotion to Christ which touch a tender chord in the human heart, and, in spite of all that Ritschl may say to the contrary, represent a very vital element in Christian piety.

We have seen that while Latin hymnody started by adhering to classical models, it came in course of time to abandon them and to adopt other types of poetical form. This tendency was accentuated by the introduction of Sequences; but after the Re-

naissance an attempt was made to revise the Breviary and make the hymns contained in it conform to classical standards. A considerable number of hymns were rejected, many were re-written, and Pope Urban VIII, under whom the work was brought to a termination, was able to assert, in authorising the book, that with very few exceptions all the hymns had been made conformable to the laws of prosody and Latinity, those which could not be corrected by any milder method being entirely re-written. This is the Hymnary now in general use in the Roman Catholic Church.

The music of these Latin hymns was plainsong melody sung in unison, similar in respect of tonality to that employed generally throughout the liturgy, but with less of its rhythmical freedom. This latter difference is the result of the new form the text assumed which the music was to accompany. Originally plainsong had been designed for prose, and one of its outstanding characteristics was that it had no fixed recurring accent, but accommodated itself to the varying accent of the prose text. But now that the text became metrical, the music naturally acquired a certain measure of regularity. Not, of course, that it ever approximated to the fixed rhythm of the modern hymn tune. With the desire to introduce plainsong into our modern worship, musical editors have sometimes endeavoured to reproduce it in the form of measured music, writing the melodies in notes of different lengths so

as to make it arrange itself in bars like any modern piece of music. But such procedure is indefensible. It is an attempt to reconcile two things fundamentally incompatible. The very *raison d'être* of plainsong, the feature which gives it its name, is that absence of regular rhythm which is the characteristic of the *musica mensurata*, the measured music to which it is opposed. This had been the outstanding characteristic of plainsong from the beginning. In course of time the Church became more and more wedded to it as the opposite pole, so to speak, to the music of the dance with its regular rhythm, upon which it looked with disfavour. The substitution of the metrical hymn for the prose text was in itself a partial abandonment of that freedom of rhythm to which it clung so fondly. But it is a far cry from the limited restriction of rhythmical liberty, necessitated by adaptation to metrical forms, to the rigid fixity of measured music ; and any attempt to reproduce plainsong in this form is simply to travesty it.

Some of the melodies that have come down to us are very beautiful, and one wonders if they could not be introduced into our worship. The difficulties in the way are considerable. First there is the question of text. " Plainsong," as M. Widor says,[1] " is of a complex species ; it has two faces, like Janus. To be understood, it must be listened to at once from a literary and a musical standpoint. Take the most

[1] Preface to Pirro's *J. S. Bach, The Organist*, p. xvii.

beautiful type of the Plain-chant, for instance: the *Te Deum*. Simply vocalise it, sing it without words; rhythm, beauty, grandeur, all disappear. Translate it, and sing the same music with either French or German text, it becomes absurd. If the Roman Church had not prescribed Latin as the language of its liturgy, we should have no Plain-chant to-day." There is much truth in these words. While we may not accept them in the strictness of the letter and rule out an English text altogether, we must admit that there is an enormous loss by the abandonment of the Latin, and that a plainsong rendering of an English version is at best a kind of makeshift. And there are other difficulties as well in the way of securing the use of plainsong melodies in our congregations. Apart from the difference of tonality, which should not, I think, prove a formidable obstacle, there is the freedom of rhythm which is likely to cause considerable trouble. It will be no easy thing to get our congregations, whom it is difficult enough to induce to join in the singing at all, to lay aside that sense of strict rhythm, which has with many become ingrained as a constituent element of music, and to give themselves up to the swing of the words. At present the matter is only more or less in the experimental stage. But it will be a decided gain to our Church praise if the plain-song music of the ancient hymns can secure an established place in our congregational praise. There is something to stir the imagination in the thought

that when we are using a version of one of the old Latin hymns, we are singing it to the melody with which it has been associated down through the centuries. Originally, of course, the plainsong melody was sung in unison, without instrumental accompaniment. The unison performance must on no account be abandoned, but it is too much, perhaps, to expect the organ to keep silent. But if it is to accompany, then care should be taken that the harmonies are founded upon the old Church modes. Nothing could be more incongruous or offensive to pure taste than to have a plainsong melody accompanied with modern harmonies. It is like dressing up a Roman hero in a frock coat and top hat.

Leaving Latin hymnody, let us now turn to Germany and note its contribution to the treasury of Christian song. It is on the grandest scale in respect both of quantity and quality. Julian estimates the number of hymns in the German language as not less than a hundred thousand, and some of these are among the most highly prized treasures in the literature of devotion. It was at the Reformation that the great outburst of German song took place, but before that date the religious Muse had not been altogether silent. There had been a spiritual side to the lyrics of the Minnesinger which made them border at times on the language of devotion. While in other countries the elaboration of the music of the service consequent on the Gregorian reform had deprived the congregation of participation, in Germany

people had been in the habit of interspersing verses of the vernacular among certain parts of the liturgy. The religious festivals with their holiday celebrations had called forth numerous carols and poems in praise of the virgin, written sometimes in the vernacular, sometimes in a mixture of the vernacular and Latin, a species of composition which was in vogue in Germany from the tenth to the sixteenth century. A good specimen of this class of carol is: "*In dulci jubilo.*" Here is the first verse of the version of it given in the "Gude and Godlie Ballates," which preserves the same alternation of the vernacular with Latin as in the German:—

In dulci jubilo,
Now let us sing with mirth and jo!
Our hartis consolation
Lies in præsepio;
And schynis as the Sonne
Matris in gremio.
Alpha es et O,
Alpha es et O!

In spite of the crudity of the poetry, we feel in these old popular carols the striving of a genuine spirit of devotion to find articulate utterance; and we can well understand what a hold they would lay on the heart of the people. It was a sound instinct that made Luther take over such outpourings of the popular Muse into the Reformed Church.

Among other precursors of the Reformation

hymnody, it is right that we should note the contribution of the Bohemian or Hussite Brethren. This Church seems to have made extensive use of hymns whether original or translations, and had a collection of eighty-nine issued in 1501. Some of these hymns were translated into German by Michael Weisse, who had been sent by the "United Brethren"—so the Bohemian Church called itself—on a mission to Luther. Luther was much impressed by the work and highly commended it; and many of these hymns were afterwards introduced into the Lutheran hymn-books.

But it was the Reformation that opened the flood-gates from which poured forth the great stream of German song. The hymnody of the Catholic Church had been mainly objective. It lost itself in devout contemplation of the divine works of Creation and Providence, of the great events of sacred history and the great truths of Christian doctrine. It sang of them as they were in themselves, rather than as they produced an effect upon the heart and life of man. But in the Reformation all the emphasis is laid upon the experience of the believer. Its central doctrine is justification by faith; and faith is a subjective, personal thing, the actual appropriation and realisation within one's own experience of the truths and blessings of religion. Such doctrine is essentially democratic in tendency. The difference between clergy and laity disappears. Both are alike sinners in need of the

divine mercy ; both are alike, in virtue of the faith which unites them to Christ, consecrated priests unto God. There is no longer need of any intermediary between man and God, of priest to make intercession, of official singers to offer praise. *The* matter of importance is the participation of the spirit, that the prayer rise from a heart that yearns for communion with God, that the praise be the outpouring of a heart all afire with thanksgiving for the divine mercy.

> The heart aye's the part aye
> That maks us right or wrong.

Men realised that it was their own personal experience that was the all-important thing in religion. It was this that found expression in their song. They sang of what they had themselves experienced, of what they looked upon with their own eyes and handled with their own hands of the word of life. This lent a note of sincerity to their song that there was no mistaking, and made it popular in the truest sense of the word. As they sang every man in his own tongue, so their fellow-believers seemed to hear every man in his own tongue. It was deep calling to deep, and the listeners soon caught up and thrilled with their own feeling the song in which their own experience of the grace and mercy of God seemed to find expression.

Luther was keenly alive to the value of music in the movement he inaugurated. He desired, as he

said in the preface to his hymn-book of 1545, that this "beautiful ornament might in a right manner serve the great Creator and His Christian people." He had given the people the Bible in their own tongue. By the aid of music he sought to make the Word of God speak home directly to the heart in a language even more potent. But equally important from the evangelical point of view was the response of man to the appeal of the divine grace. For this too he made provision, supplying words and music for the new song that experience of that grace had put into man's mouth. A lover of poetry and himself a trained musician, he was quick to realise and take full advantage of the power of Christian song to advance the cause so dear to his heart. He gathered round him a group of musical friends to assist him in the compilation of a hymn-book. "I wish," he wrote in 1524, "after the example of the Prophets and Ancient Fathers of the Church, to make German psalms for the people, that is to say, sacred hymns, so that the Word of God may dwell among the people by means of song also." His hymns, thirty-seven in number, were of various types; some translations from Latin originals; some paraphrases of Psalms or passages of Scripture; some for the great festivals of the Church; some didactic in character, designed to instruct the people in the mysteries of the faith. There is a rugged strength and manly simplicity about them that make direct appeal to the heart.

They are like the man himself in their strength and sanity and directness of purpose. One there is above all others that seems the very embodiment of the spirit of the intrepid reformer, the well-known "*Ein feste Burg.*" It is doubtful whether it was written, as has been alleged, in view of his famous visit to Worms. But whether or not, it breathes the spirit in which the hero on that occasion advanced, like another David, to the unequal conflict; and throughout the ages this grand hymn, the Marseillaise of the Reformation, as Heine called it, will never lose its spell as the great battle song of the saints as they rally against the hosts of evil that beset them. Luther was not mistaken in his estimate of the assistance that the new hymnody would render to the Reformation. His hymns were caught up by the people and sung everywhere, in their homes, their places of work, their social gatherings. By their use in public worship the whole service acquired a congregational character such as it had never had since the days of the early Church.

In preparing the music for the new hymnody, Luther acted on the same principle as with regard to the text—he took whatever suited him and made such changes as he felt to be necessary. When the hymn was a translation the tune of the original was retained, the words being adapted to the original melody. When the hymn was new, a tune was either sought out or composed for it. In his search for a suitable tune he did not confine himself to

sacred melodies, but drew boldly upon secular material if it would serve his purpose. As I have already said, some of the most impressive German chorale melodies were originally written to secular words. Sometimes a new tune was composed for the occasion, as in the case of "*Ein feste Burg.*" Here again Luther was more concerned about serviceableness than about suspicion of plagiarism. It has been demonstrated that the melody of "*Ein feste Burg*" is a patchwork of snippets from the Roman Gradual. That may very well be, but it was none the less a work of genius to weave these snippets into a coherent whole. We may say of Luther, as Landor said of Shakespeare, that "he was more original than his originals. He breathed upon dead bodies, and brought them into life."

Time would not suffice to give anything like a detailed account of the further course of German hymnody. Only one or two of the salient points may be mentioned. The terrible experience which the nation underwent during the Thirty Years' War served only to make the lamp of faith burn more brightly. The hymns that date from that period are among the sweetest and purest in the whole Christian treasure of song :—

> Most wretched men
> Are cradled into poetry by wrong :
> They learn in suffering what they teach in song.

So it was with the religious poets of Germany during

those unhappy times. Amid the wreck of their earthly hopes, they clung more closely to their heavenly comforter. "*Valet will ich dir geben, du arge falsche Welt*" ("I bid thee farewell, thou false and evil world") sings Herberger during the ravages of the plague—and that is the attitude towards the world of many of the hymns of this unhappy time. "*Verzage nicht du Häuflein klein*" ("Fear not, O little flock, the foe"), sung by Gustavus Adolphus and his army before the battle of Lützen, and thought by some to be composed by the Swedish King himself: "*Wer nur den lieben Gott lässt walten*" ("If thou but suffer God to guide thee"), a hymn which breathes a fine trust in divine Providence, by Neumark: Reinkart's great hymn of thanksgiving: "*Nun danket alle Gott*" ("Now thank we all our God"), which may be called the German "*Te Deum*," and is still used on occasions of national thanksgiving—these are some of the great hymns that date from this period. Another name worthy of mention is that of Paul Gerhardt, perhaps the greatest of all the German hymn-writers. His hymns lack something of the force and virility of Luther's. Chaste and refined in diction, they strike a more subjective, a more tender note. But their appeal is none the less direct and forcible, and some of them, such, e.g., as "*O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden*" ("O sacred Head now wounded"), "*Nun ruhen alle Wälder*" ("The duteous day now closeth"), "*Befiehl du deine Wege*" ("Commit thou

all thy ways") will remain, as Vilmar says,[1] "for all coming time the most precious pearls in the chaplet of German poetry, and the noblest treasures of the evangelical Church." The subjective tendency which we have noted in German hymnody became more and more pronounced among the Pietists and Moravians. The Pietistic movement was a reaction against the formalism and satisfied orthodoxy of the Lutheran Church, not unlike the Methodism of England. The Pietists did not sever their connexion with the Lutheran Church; but the Moravians under the Graf von Zinzendorf formed a separate community, which was, indeed, a resuscitation of the Bohemian Brethren of pre-Reformation times. The hymns of both these movements breathe a warm spirit of devotion, and are evidently the outpourings of a deep religious experience. Among the names of hymn-writers of the type referred to may be mentioned Terstegen. He belonged originally to the Reformed Church; but he withdrew from it and became the leader of a branch of mystics, the "*Stillen im Lande*" as they called themselves. His hymns reflect the spirit of the believer who feels that his life is hid with Christ in God. Though not many of them have found a place in our hymn-books, Terstegen exercised a considerable influence upon the English hymn-writers of the latter part of the eighteenth century.

[1] *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, p. 299.

Of the music of the German hymns it will be unnecessary to speak at any length. We are all familiar with the type of tune known as the German chorale. Several examples are included in our hymn-books, such as "*Ein feste Burg*," "*Nun danket*," the Passion Chorale. Some of the melodies are taken from old Church tunes, others were drawn from secular sources, others were original. They are admirably fitted for congregational singing, and have secured a place in the affections of the German people. But the manner in which they are rendered in Germany differs from our style of congregational singing, and it is questionable whether the treasure that is here presented to us can be to any great extent successfully drawn upon for the enrichment of our hymn-books. In Germany the congregation sit during the singing of the chorale, and the rate of singing is slow in the extreme. While it is too much to expect our congregations to slow down their tempo to the German rate, one must protest against any attempt to take a German chorale tune at the same pace as that of an English hymn. That is simply to travesty it. There is a tune to a hymn to which I have already referred: "*Valet will ich dir geben*," which as a student I used to hear sung very often in John Sebastian Bach's church in Leipzig — I think it was sung almost every Sunday evening —not to the words of the original hymn but to a little dismission hymn: "*Lass mich dein sein.*" It is included in our collections under the name

St. Theodulph, and set to the hymn for Palm Sunday. I must confess that to hear it rattled through at march time, as it is usually rendered when sung to this setting, with the first half of the melody given *da capo* to fit the refrain, seems to me little short of profanation. Better leave these chorale tunes aside altogether than caricature them by taking them at a pace against which the whole spirit of the music is at variance. But if we can get our congregations to sing them, if not quite with the German deliberation, at a slow stately pace suited to the solemn dignity of the music, then they offer a fruitful field upon which to draw for the enrichment of our congregational praise, and provide a welcome contrast to the mawkish sentimentality of many of our hymn tunes.

I turn now to sketch in rapid outline the history of hymnody in England. Here the rise of a native congregational hymnody did not, as in Germany, coincide with the Reformation, but was deferred for over a century. This was due partly to the troubled history of the times with its kaleidoscopic changes in the political and ecclesiastical situation, partly to the place of honour assigned to the metrical version of the Psalms. The Puritan regime was unfavourable to the rise of hymnody, and after the Restoration the stringency of the Conventicle Act discouraged singing in Nonconformist circles. At the time of the Reformation very few of the Latin hymns of the Church found their way into the service books. Luther had

incorporated several in his hymn-books for the people, but the "*Veni Creator*" was the only one that gained a place in the Book of Common Prayer, though others of the Latin hymns were admitted into the primers and books of devotion. So far as the legal position was concerned, there does not seem to have been any difficulty about the introduction of hymns into the service, for an Injunction of Queen Elizabeth ran to the effect that "for the comforting of such that delight in music, it may be permitted that in the beginning or in the end of Common Prayer, either at morning or evening, there may be sung an hymn, or such like song to the praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of melody and music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of hymn may be understanded and perceived." And at first we note a tendency to follow the Lutheran example and introduce hymns into divine service. Coverdale's *Goostly Psalmes and Spiritualle Songes* contains fifteen hymns, mostly derived from German sources. The 1562 edition of Sternhold and Hopkins contains not only some metrical versions of the Canticles, but some original hymns. But the disregard of the Genevan ban against anything unscriptural was only partial and temporary, and for the next century the blighting influence of the Calvinistic canon of Church praise arrested the progress of congregational hymnody in England. This period of incubation had one satisfactory result. It determined the direction in which

English hymnody was to develop. The Calvinistic restriction admitted nothing but what was Scriptural. Consequently the practice arose of paraphrasing various passages of Scripture, such, e.g., as the Song of Solomon, and extracts from the prophets, while Christopher Tye composed music for twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Grotesque as some of those specimens of Scripture paraphrases are—there was even a metrical version of the genealogies—they yet mark a tendency which was to prove fruitful in benefit to English hymnody, viz., adherence to Scripture as the underlying principle of sound hymn-writing. At its best our English hymnody is ever in close and warm sympathy with the thought and language of Scripture. Like another Antæus it is strong only when its feet rest upon the solid ground of Scripture. Dr. Watts says in his preface that "he might have brought some text and applied it to the margin of every verse." It is this close touch with Scriptural doctrine, far more than its poetical merit, that lends its power to many a favourite hymn.

While it was not till the beginning of the eighteenth century that the real outburst of English hymnody took place, there are some earlier essays worthy of mention. The earliest hymn-book published was George Wither's *Hymnes and Songs of the Church* (1623). The King granted him a patent according to which they were declared to be "worthy and profitable to be inserted, in a convenient

manner and due place, into every English Psalm-book to metre." The collection contains hymns for every week day, for certain Church seasons and festivals, and for various other occasions and circumstances. It is of special musical interest as Orlando Gibbons contributed music in various metres, sixteen tunes in all. Some of these, such as Songs 34 and 67 (known as Angels or Angels' Song and St. Matthias) have a place in our Church tune books. Others which have fallen into neglect have been revived in some recent hymnals, and form a welcome addition to our repertory. Among other hymn-writers of the seventeenth century I may mention Cosin, Bishop of Durham, whose shorter version of the "*Veni Creator*" was introduced into the consecration and ordination services of the Church of England; Jeremy Taylor; Richard Baxter, from whose *Poetical Fragments* there are still one or two hymns in use; Bishop Ken, whose morning and evening hymns enjoy universal popularity; and, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Joseph Addison, to whom we owe "The spacious firmament on high," and "When all Thy mercies, O my Lord."

But it was not till Dr. Watts that English hymnody really awoke to a sense of its power and put it forth to the full. It was he who raised the hymn to the place of honour which it was henceforth to hold in the worship of the Church in England. He was a minister of the Independent Church, and his whole life was one struggle against ill-health and adversity.

But his hymns breathe a spirit of cheerfulness and gratitude remarkable in one so sorely tried. They are the outpourings of a heart "lost in wonder, love, and praise" at the mercy of God in Christ Jesus. He composed a large number of hymns; and while they are unequal in quality, and sometimes sink to the sheerest commonplace, still the best of them are among the choicest treasures of the language, and will live for ever in the praise of the Church. Many of them which we think of as hymns were published originally in his *Psalms of David*, and were meant to be versions of Old Testament Psalms from the New Testament point of view, as he said "expressed as I may suppose David would have done, had he lived in the days of Christianity." Thus his "Jesus shall reign" is a version of the 72nd Psalm, and "Our God, our help in ages past" of the 90th. It is to Watts that we owe "There is a land of pure delight," "I'm not ashamed to own my Lord," and what, perhaps, is the greatest of all his hymns, "When I survey the wondrous Cross." They secure him a high place among English hymn-writers. As Lord Selborne[1] says: "As long as pure nervous English, unaffected fervour, strong simplicity and liquid yet manly sweetness are admitted to be characteristics of a good hymn, works such as these must command admiration." His importance in the history of English hymnody is

[1] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Art. "Hymns."

to be measured not merely by his own output, though that was remarkable, but by the influence he exercised upon his contemporaries and successors. He seems to have opened the flood-gates and let out a volume of praise that was chafing to vent itself.

The next landmark in the history of English hymnody is the Methodist movement. John Wesley, like Ephraim the Syrian, realised the value of the hymn as an instrument for the dissemination of doctrine, and he designed the hymns which he put into the hands of his followers to be "a body of experimental and practical divinity." In the first volume of hymns published by the two brothers John and Charles Wesley, John's contribution consisted chiefly of translations from the German, and the number of original hymns to his credit is small. His brother Charles was the great hymn-writer of the Wesley family. He is credited with over 6000 hymns. While it is only to be expected that in such an enormous output the proportion of dross to pure metal should be very great, still there are among his hymns some gems of the purest water. "O for a thousand tongues, to sing," "Rejoice, the Lord is King," "Hark, how all the welkin rings" ("Hark, the herald angels sing"), and "Jesus, Lover of my soul,"—these are some the mere mention of which will suffice to show the debt which the Church owes to Charles Wesley. Among other hymn-writers inspired by the Methodist movement, mention should be made of Byrom ("Christians, awake,

salute the happy morn"), Toplady ("Rock of Ages") and the Welsh William Williams ("Guide me, O Thou great Jehovah"). The Olney hymns by William Cowper and John Newton reach a high level of excellence. The note of jubilation is somewhat lacking, but they breathe a spirit of strong faith and warm love to Christ. Newton laid down the principle that "the imagery and colouring of poetry, if admitted at all, should be indulged very sparingly and with great judgment." If we are to judge by the resultant appeal to the masses, it seems to work well, for some of the most popular of our hymns are taken from this collection, e.g., "Hark, my soul, it is the Lord," "God moves in a mysterious way," "Sometimes a light surprises," "There is a fountain filled with Blood," by Cowper, and "Glorious things of Thee are spoken," and "Approach, my soul, the mercy seat," by Newton.

During the nineteenth century various influences contributed to the advance of English hymnody. The doubt which existed in many quarters as to the admissibility of hymns into the worship of the Church of England was removed. The publication of Bishop Heber's *Hymns written and adapted to the Weekly Church Service of the Year* in 1827, with a permitted dedication to the Archbishop of Canterbury, though not, as had been hoped, with his express authority, contributed in some measure to this result. The tendencies within the Church of England which culminated in the Oxford movement

were not without their influence upon hymnody. Interest in ancient hymns was revived, and a great number of new versions of these appeared, which soon found their way into public worship. German hymnody likewise was laid under contribution, and a considerable number of new translations from this source began to appear. Keble's *Christian Year* enriched the Church with some excellent hymns, and was a fruitful source of inspiration to English hymnody in general. Various collections of hymns for use in public worship made their appearance, and an endeavour to secure uniformity led to the publication in 1861 of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* which was most heartily received, and has held the field ever since as the book most generally used throughout the Church of England.

In Scotland the Calvinistic ban against anything unscriptural led to the metrical Psalter monopolising for a long time the whole of the praise. At the time of the introduction of the new Psalter there was a proposal to include a set of Scriptural songs by Zachary Boyd. The matter indeed got the length of the Assembly of 1648 appointing a small committee to examine the work of Boyd and report. But for some reason the proposal fell through, and the new Psalter when it appeared had no extraneous matter. But in the middle of the eighteenth century the proposal to have some other passages of Scripture versified for use in worship was again mooted, and after many delays the work was at length carried

through, and a collection of sixty-seven paraphrases and five hymns was produced in 1781. This the Assembly sent down to the Presbyteries of the Church, " and in the meantime they allow this collection of sacred poems to be used in public worship, where the Minister finds it for edification." That was the end of the matter, for no report was received from the committee to which the Assembly remitted the matter. Thus the only authority for the use of the Paraphrases in public worship is this temporary and qualified approval of the Assembly of 1781. The collection of Paraphrases thus admitted has established itself in popular favour. While the most of the contributors belonged to the Church of Scotland, there were two well-known Englishmen whose works were included, Watts and Doddridge, the former being responsible for no less than twenty-one and the latter for four, two of Doddridge's, however, being among the best known and best loved of the Paraphrases, viz., " O God of Bethel," and " Father of Peace." Of the five hymns admitted with the Paraphrases, three were by Joseph Addison and one by Dr. Watts.

In Scotland as in England it was to Nonconformist activity that the Church was indebted at first for the movement in favour of hymns. The Relief Church was the pioneer, its Synod approving in 1794 of the use of a " Selection of Hymns and Sacred Songs." This Relief Church joined with the United Secession Church to form the United Presbyterian

Church; and in 1857 the Synod of this Church authorised the publication of a hymn-book containing 460 hymns. In the Church of Scotland the matter was agitated, and in 1861 a selection of hymns was permitted to be published by the Committee on Psalmody, "it being understood," so ran the Deliverance, "that the sanction of the General Assembly is not hereby given to the selection that may be made." In 1870 a new collection called *The Scottish Hymnal* was published with the sanction of the Assembly; and in 1898 a joint hymn-book for the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church in Ireland was published under the title, *The Church Hymnary*. This book is at present in process of revision, and in the work of revision the Presbyterian Church of England and the Presbyterian Church of Wales have participated with a view to the adoption of the revised Hymnary by these Churches.

It remains now to speak of the music to which the hymns are sung, and to trace the development of the English hymn-tune. As we have seen, the rise of hymnody in England and Scotland was seriously delayed by the dominance of metrical Psalms. But this delay was not without its compensation also on the musical side, for the metrical Psalms, which stood in the way of the introduction of hymns, called forth a kind of tune of high excellence. Not only did the Psalm-tunes of the period set an admirable example of the type of music fitted

for congregational praise, they likewise were found in many cases quite suitable for adaptation to hymns when these began to make their appearance. The earliest type of English hymn-tune was either a Psalm-tune or very like a Psalm-tune in character, with much dignity of movement, solemn and stately. Its harmony is diatonic, which lends to it strength and massiveness. It avoids passing notes, and makes each syllable of the words correspond to a note of the music. It may come, perhaps, to pall by its severity, and in course of time the craving for some variation led to the development of a different style. But there can be no question as to its appropriateness for use in divine worship, alike by its devotional spirit and its singability by a united congregation.

In the musicians of the post-Restoration period, such, e.g., as Jeremiah Clarke and Dr. Croft, Bishop, and later Dr. Samuel Howard, the high standard of the earlier Psalm-tunes is maintained. It is to Dr. Croft, for instance, that we owe St. Anne. But in some tunes one notes a slight relaxation of the gravity which marks the original Psalm-tune, not enough to detract in any way from their suitability for use in Church worship, yet just sufficient to mark the difference of atmosphere between a hymn and a metrical Psalm. For this reason the tunes of these composers strike me as being admirable examples of what a hymn-tune ought to be. They are melodious and singable, and have that warmth of feeling about them that gives them a ring of hearti-

ness when sung. The purist may take exception to them on this very account. Dr. Crotch, I believe, condemned Croft's Hanover, which by the way was originally a Psalm-tune. But why should Church music be cold and formal, without any warmth and colour in it? It is a false conception of religion that discountenances any genuine expression of feeling.[1] The feelings will not be suppressed. Why should they? This warmer tone in the music of the school I am referring to was an attempt to do justice to a religious tendency which would not be denied, and which, failing adequate provision being made for it, will seek expression, as we know too well to our cost, in other and less defensible forms.

And indeed that is what followed. When the full outburst of hymnody took place in England under the influence of Watts and Wesley, its exuberance broke through the restraints of the existing forms of Church music. The new wine required new bottles, and some of the bottles that were at first called into requisition were rather sorry makeshifts. The exuberance of feeling to which I have referred found satisfaction in tunes whose florid character formed a striking contrast to the massive dignity of the older tunes; in bright and catchy melodies no matter from what source they

[1] "Mrs. Rachael was too good to feel any emotion at parting, but I was not so good, and wept bitterly" (C. Dickens, *Bleak House*, chap. iii.).

were taken—one popular tune which still figures in our hymn-books was danced as a hornpipe at one of the theatres, though whether the hornpipe was taken from the tune or the tune from the hornpipe is a moot point; in tunes with a rollicking refrain or with repeated lines which sometimes led to shocking outrages on decorum, such, e.g., as—

> And even in this calm abode
> May Thy pure spirit be, rit be
> And guide us in the narrow road
> That terminates, minates in Thee.

These and similar abuses reduced English hymn music of the latter part of the eighteenth century to a pitiful condition. But in course of time the work of reform came about. A new generation arose who sought to purge the temple of what defiled it. The quickened liturgical sense induced by the Oxford movement could not fail to take offence at the vulgarity of the music presented as an offering to God. There are many names worthy of remembrance in connexion with the work of reform—Samuel Wesley, Samuel Sebastian Wesley, Dr. Gauntlett, Dr. Monk, Dr. Dykes, and several others whose hymn-tunes are familiar to all of us. It is only right that we should recognise how much we are indebted to them. In order to do justice to their work, we must realise the low level to which the hymn-tune had sunk in the preceding period. If we could immerse ourselves in the depressing hymn music of

that time, we should better appreciate the work that was done by these men in rescuing the congregational music of the Church from the miserable condition to which it had been reduced. But while we gladly recognise the indebtedness of the Church to these men for what they accomplished, that should not blind us to their defects, or make us accept the type of tune which they specially favoured as the standard to which our present-day hymn-books should conform. There are many respects in which the hymn-tunes of the Victorian age are defective. They are often too sweet and sentimental, too much of the "Sweet and low" type of part-song, too much dependent upon chromatic harmonies and lacking in strong, characterful melody. With all deference to the work of reformation accomplished in the field of English hymn-tune music by the Victorian composers, one feels that their influence has been rather in excess of the inherent merit of their work, and that there has been too much tendency in the Church music of the last fifty years or so to set them up as models. "The Church of Christ," says Mr. Martin Shaw,[1] "has been established for 2000 years, and during that time has, without pause, inspired and brought into being an immense amount of music of a very high order, including thousands of the world's finest

[1] Article on "Hymn Festivals," *Daily Telegraph*, 27th September, 1924.

tunes. It is not too much to say that of the music of those 2000 years the Church of England to-day refuses to sing any but that of the period from 1860 to 1890. Even if this were a great period of production it would be wrong to draw from it to-day to the exclusion of other periods. But it was not a great period. On the contrary, musicians are agreed that it was an exceedingly poor period. Certainly it would be safe to say that nearly all the hymn-tunes composed in that period were feeble recollections of the weaker moments of Mendelssohn, Spohr, and Gounod." There is much truth in these words. They hold good not only of the Church of England, but of other Churches in England and Scotland as well. All our hymn-books are far too full of tunes of the Victorian type. Yet why should we restrict ourselves to it? Why should we decline to take advantage of the vast treasure of music eminently suited for congregational use that has been accumulated throughout the ages? I plead strongly for a more catholic spirit in the selection of tunes for our hymnals. Think how rich and varied are the stores at our disposal! There is first of all the Plainsong of the early Church, which we should certainly draw upon for the ancient hymns which still find a place in our hymn-books. Even though its introduction be a matter of some difficulty, it is only right that the opportunity should be given to such congregations as desire to employ it to sing the ancient hymns to the tunes with which they

have been associated from the beginning. An alternative setting can always be provided for those who find it difficult to accommodate themselves to the freedom of its rhythm. Then there are the ecclesiastical melodies of various Continental Churches, many of which have a swing and movement about them that must, one would think, rouse even the most stolid congregation and carry them along. Take, for instance, "*Deus tuorum militum.*" Does it not seem to catch one up and make one join in, whether one will or no? Then there are the old proper tunes from the Genevan and English and Scottish Psalters. Some are dull and lacking in character. But others are very fine, and should be rescued from the oblivion into which they have been allowed to fall. Then there are the common tunes from the old Psalters. Some of these are in constant use amongst us for our metrical Psalms. But after all the number of these is comparatively small. I have pleaded for the use of a larger number in our singing of the metrical Psalms; but so long as the cut-leaf system obtains in our Psalm-books I am not sanguine that we shall succeed in bringing into current use many of the tunes that are now in danger of falling into desuetude. Why should they not be incorporated in our new hymn-books? They are vastly superior to many of the tunes in our present books. Then there are the Lutheran chorale tunes, with a dignity and solemnity that leave no doubt as to their suitability for divine

worship. Then there are the English tunes by the composers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, strong, rich, and satisfying, popular in the best sense of the word. Then there is the great body of Welsh tunes, the tunes of a people who can show us what community singing really is. It seems only wise to draw far more largely than we have done upon this rich store of melody which has proved in practice so full of inspiration and power. Then there are the carols and traditional melodies and folk-songs of the various countries, some with secular associations so strong that they are not available for Church use, but others the words of which have been forgotten, and which may therefore be fitly claimed for sacred purposes. These are some of the sources available for the enrichment of our hymn-books. The revision of the *Church Hymnary*, on which the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland and Ireland and England and Wales are at present engaged, offers a grand opportunity for making the book, in respect of music, more catholic and representative than it was before, and for raising the standard of congregational music to a higher level. It is to be hoped that it will be fully taken advantage of, and that the wealth of tunes presented to our congregations may stimulate their interest in the music of the sanctuary, and enrich the volume of praise which the Church raises to its Head.

LECTURE V.

THE CHOIR.

In the early days of the Church it had been the custom of the people to take part in the singing. "From the first and apostolical age," says Bingham,[1] "singing was always a part of divine service, in which the whole body of the Church joined together: which is a thing so evident, that though Cabassutius denies it, and in his spite to the Reformed Churches, where it is generally practised, calls it only *a Protestant whim;* yet Cardinal Bona has more than once not only confessed, but solidly proved it to have been the primitive practice." But with the development of the ritual and liturgy of the Church, the musical side of the worship was more and more relegated to a trained choir composed of minor ecclesiastics, and the participation of the congregation reduced to occasional responses. However regrettable such a policy from many points of view, it had at least this merit, that it gave the composers

[1] *Christian Antiquities*, iii. 7, § 2.

of Church music a much freer hand. They were no longer restricted to what lay within the powers of the uneducated multitude, but were free to indulge their musical fancy to the full, and to make use of all the known resources of the art, nay, to exercise their ingenuity in the evolution of new and more and more intricate devices, so that under the fostering care of the Church the art of music made some of its most striking advances.

With the Reformation the interests of the congregation came to be recognised, and their participation in the musical side of the service securely established. So strong, indeed, was the reaction, that in certain of the Reformed Churches the whole emphasis was laid upon the congregational song, and anything of a more elaborate nature was rejected. Calvin would admit nothing but the Psalms of David sung in unison. On that view of Church praise the occupation of the choir was gone. But while this narrow conception of Church music had great vogue in most of the Reformed Churches, there were certain notable exceptions, namely, the Lutheran and the English Churches. Luther's first proposal [1] had been to restrict the music of the Church to the congregational chorale. But he was a musician at heart. His favourite composer was Josquin des Près, one of the great masters of the Netherland school. And he was keenly alive to the service that music might

[1] *Ordnung des Gottesdienstes in der Gemeinde*, 1523.

render, not only in its popular forms such as were utilised in the chorale tunes, but likewise in its higher developments. To him music was a manifestation of God, and the right course seemed to be not to banish it from the Church, but rather to consecrate it to the service of God. "I am not of opinion," he wrote,[1] "that on account of the Gospel all the arts should be crushed out of existence, as some over-religious people pretend, but I would willingly see all the arts, especially music, in the service of Him who has given and created them." He took special delight in music of the contrapuntal type, and has given a most vivid description of this style of music, "in which," as he says,[2] "this is most singular and indeed astonishing, that one man sings a simple tune or tenor (as musicians call it), together with which three, four, or five voices also sing, which, as it were, play and skip delightedly round this simple tune or tenor, and wonderfully grace and adorn the said tune with manifold devices and sounds, performing as it were a heavenly dance, so that those who at all understand it and are moved by it must be greatly amazed, and believe that there is nothing more extraordinary in the world than such a song adorned with many voices." It is not surprising that a man who cherished this high conception

[1] Preface to Walther's chorale parts, 1524.

[2] Preface to Walther's *Lob und Preis der himmlischen Kunst Musica*, 1564.

of music as a manifestation of God should have reserved a place in the Liturgy for music of a more elaborate character, and given the choir an established position in the performance of the service.

In England also, but for different reasons, the choir remained undisturbed, and the elaborate music of the pre-Reformation Church was carried over into the Church of England. The change in the ecclesiastical situation caused by the Reformation was not nearly so violent in England as it was elsewhere. The tendency was to minimise rather than to accentuate the differences between the old and the new order. There was a strong party which favoured the opposite policy, and desired to make the breach with Rome complete and definitive. These Puritans, as this party was styled, had no sympathy with the elaborate music of the Church service, and raised a great outcry against organs and curious singing and the tossing of the Psalms " like Tennice Balles," as they described antiphonal singing. What would have been the fate of Church music in England at this time had they had their way, is shown by what happened afterwards during the Puritan regime, when the cathedral services were suppressed, the choirs disbanded, and the organs destroyed. But fortunately for the interests of music the Puritan extremists did not carry the day. The Church of England retained as much as possible of the doctrine and practice of the pre-Reformation Church, and there was but little change

in the musical arrangements of the service. English texts were substituted for the Latin ones, care was taken to ensure generally that the words of the music should be intelligible to the hearers, but otherwise things remained pretty much as they were. An injunction of Queen Elizabeth in 1559 runs as follows: "For the encouragement, and the continuance of the use of singing in the Church of England, it is injoined; that is to say, that in divers collegiat, as well as some parish churches, heretofore there hath been livings appointed for the maintenance of men and children for singing in the church, by means whereof the laudable exercise of Musick hath been had in estimation, and preserved in knowledge; the Queen's Majesty neither meaning in any wise the decay of any that might conveniently tend to the use and continuance of the said science, neither to have the same so abused in any part of the church, that thereby the Common Prayer should be worse understood by the hearers, willeth and commandeth, that, first, no alterations be made of such assignments of living as heretofore hath been appointed to the use of singing or Musick in the church, but that the same so remain, and that there be a modest and distinct song, so used in all parts of the common prayers of the church, that the same may be plainly understood as if it were without singing; and yet nevertheless, for the comforting of such as delight in Musick, it may be permitted, that in the beginning or in the end of common prayer,

either at morning or evening, there may be sung an hymn, or such like song, to the praise of Almighty God, in the best melody and musick that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of the hymn may be understood and perceived." From this it appears that the endowed choirs hitherto in existence remained undisturbed. The choir of the Chapel Royal continued to function throughout all the vicissitudes of the Reformation period, although it is interesting to note that there was such difficulty at times in getting recruits for it that the methods of the press-gang had to be put into operation.

The historical continuity of the choir and its music in the Lutheran Church and in the Church of England exercised a great influence upon the music in these two Churches. In course of time each developed a certain type of its own ; the Lutheran Church the Cantata, and the Church of England the Service and the Anthem. While the importance assigned to congregational singing and the sweeping aside of all music of a more elaborate character caused the disappearance of the choir in the other Reformed Churches, that disappearance was only temporary. The precentor who led the singing came in course of time to have a choir to assist him. Wider ideas began to obtain as to the kind of music admissible into the Church. Hymns and chants and even anthems came to have a place in the service, and with their introduction the choir became a

necessity. But while these other Churches have restored the choir to its place, they have not been able to unite the thread of historical continuity that was broken at the Reformation. They have their choirs like the Lutheran Church and the Church of England, but they have not the ethos, the historical tradition, of these Churches ; and there may be much that is musically admirable in the services of these Churches that they find it difficult, nay impossible, to appropriate, because they lack the tradition and the atmosphere that lend it significance.

Let us turn now to consider what is the function of the choir in the worship of the Church, and how it may best discharge that function. There will be general agreement among all who recognise congregational song as the outstanding feature of the musical service, that the primary function of the choir is to encourage and support the singing of the congregation. The ideal congregational singing would, of course, be that the congregation as a whole should constitute the choir; but that is unattainable. It would mean that the whole congregation should be able to read music, that the various parts, soprano, alto, etc., should be equally balanced, and should each sit by itself. There is no likelihood of anything of the kind being attained, so there is no use discussing it. I mention it now because of a suggestion of Mr. Curwen [1] that for the improvement of congre-

[1] *Studies in Worship Music*, Second Series, p. 84.

gational singing a good plan would be to disperse the choir among the congregation. I do not believe that anything of the kind is feasible, or that, even if it were, it would lead to any perceptible improvement in the singing of the congregation. If we are to have the congregation singing in parts—and I shall discuss presently whether that is desirable—I do not see that an alto who is timorously spelling out her part will receive much encouragement from a robust tenor from the choir who happens to be sitting alongside of her. But apart from the feasibility of the plan, the fact remains that a choir thus dispersed all over the church would cease to be a choir. Its solidarity, which is its very essence, would be gone; and instead of a choir, it would now become a number of individual singers distributed at random throughout the congregation. It is no answer to the question how the choir may best foster congregational singing to suggest that the choir should cease to function as a choir, and resolve itself into its constituent members.

How shall the choir then, as a choir, best contribute to the improvement of congregational singing? First and foremost by setting clearly before itself this as the thing of first importance. Many choirmasters and choirs fail, I believe, simply because they never definitely determine what is the end they have to keep in view. They honestly strive to make the singing of the choir as good as

possible, but they do not pause to ask: Good in what sense? Good for what purpose? A thing is good or bad only as it fulfils its function; and the singing of the choir, when it is leading the congregational praise, is good or bad, not when taken by itself and judged by æsthetic standards, but when considered in relation to the end it seeks to advance and its success or failure in this respect. Now if that be so, it will mean that many choirmasters and choirs will require to reconsider their whole policy in the rendering of the music in which they have to lead the congregation. The standpoint from which judgment has to be passed must be altered. They have been too much inclined to ask: What is the best way of rendering this piece of music in itself? Whereas the question they have to consider is: What is the rendering of the music best suited to secure the co-operation of the congregation? Once that latter question is asked, then a great many of what had before appeared to be excellences must be cast aside. From the point of view of the choir alone the change may seem to involve some loss. But the mistake is to consider the rendering of the music from the point of view of the choir alone. At the practice the congregation should be present to the choirmaster in imagination. His whole rendering of the music should be determined by their interests. And the end to be kept in view is not the best performance of the music as a part-song by the choir, but the rendering that

shall best secure the co-operation of the congregation.

But what is the kind of singing that a choir should aim at in this spirit ? It must be of a character that seems at every point to offer an invitation to the congregation to join in. Its rate will be slower than it would be were the choir singing alone. There is always a tendency to drag on the part of the congregation. Now the choir have to take that into account. Not, of course, that they are to make the pace of the laggards the standard to which they have to conform. That would result in a dragging style of singing which would be intolerable. But at the same time they must not rush away from the congregation and leave them to follow or not as they please. They have to try to establish a steady, rhythmical swing which shall invite the people to fall in with it. Steadiness, solidity, sonorousness, rhythmic regularity—these are among the first things on which a choir should concentrate that desires to lead the congregation well. They have to strive at all points to encourage and support them. Anything calculated to inspire diffidence is to be deprecated. For this reason it is unwise to aim at any nicety of expression. A sudden *piano* is apt to discourage the singer in the body of the church. He finds himself singing lustily when the choir has unexpectedly dropped to a *piano*, and he resolves not to be caught again. Differences of light and shade, which the choir

would naturally aim at if singing alone, are best left aside when it is leading the congregation, and only broad and massive effects attempted. After all such a style of singing will be well suited to the character of the music, if it be music adapted for congregational singing, and not a piece of sentimental sweetness such as figures too largely in many of our hymn-books.

But before proceeding further to consider how the choir can best lead the congregation, it will be necessary to discuss first of all the question of what the nature of the congregational singing is to be, whether in unison or in harmony. In the *Report of the Archbishops' Committee of the Church of England on Music in Worship* (1922),[1] it is stated that "it is the unanimous judgment of the Committee that, with a view to improving all congregational music, the first need of the moment is a fearless revival and vigorous use of natural unison singing." This is a view to which the musical authorities of the present day are more and more inclining. It strikes me as common sense, for it is based on a frank recognition of the facts of the case. The bulk of the congregation have not the requisite musical knowledge to sing in parts—that is the one fact which in itself, one would say, should decide the matter. Whether we approve of it or not, there will always be a large proportion of the congregation

[1] P. 13.

which must either sing the melody or keep silent. Then even if the congregation had the requisite musical knowledge, what about the balance of the parts and the distribution of these parts all over the church? There is no use shutting one's eyes to these difficulties. If we are not going to adopt unison singing, then what we do really get is not anything like well-balanced part singing by the congregation as a whole, but half-hearted unison singing by a large proportion of the congregation, silence from a considerable section who might participate were hearty unison singing the established practice, and more or less tentative part singing from isolated altos, tenors, and basses scattered throughout the church. Even when they have the courage to strike in boldly, their voices do not blend with the others as they would in a well-balanced choir, but seem to stand out as individual efforts to "sing a part." That is the condition of things at present. No one will say that it is satisfactory from a musical point of view. The movement in favour of unison singing has the merit, at any rate, of recognising its unsatisfactoriness and trying to improve it. Some may challenge the word *improve*, and say that unison singing even if secured would be a retrograde step. But here again we must face the situation and aim at what is practicable. It is not maintained that unison singing is in itself better than part singing, but only that unison singing is better than such part singing as is possible of attain-

ment in the actual conditions. It has the merit that all can take part in it, whether they can read music or not. It would result in a much larger and heartier body of sound than is at present secured, and would offer a perpetual invitation to the worshipper in the body of the church to join in. It would lead to the adoption of a kind of music more fitted for congregational use than much of the "part song" type of hymn-tune which has had such vogue, for it is no bad rough and ready test of the worth of a hymn-tune whether it lends itself to unison singing or not. It would further entail the lowering of the pitch of most of our tunes, which would be much appreciated by the men in our congregations who are unable to sing the bass part and find that the melody is too high for them. Perhaps some who have been used to singing the harmony parts might feel it a deprivation to have to forgo their part singing. But I believe that such a feeling would soon disappear under the new conditions. In the heartiness and sonorousness of the unison singing of the melody all around them, calling upon them to add their voice to the common song, they would, I believe, lose the desire to strike in with any other part.

One objection frequently urged against unison singing is that it would prove monotonous. There is force in that objection, and steps should be taken to relieve the monotony as much as possible. Much can be done in this way by directing to the phrasing

and intelligent interpretation of the unison song the attention that has hitherto been expended on part singing and dynamic expression. "It is still true," says the Archbishops' Report,[1] "that there are delicacies of rhythm, phrasing, and interpretation which are fairly easily attainable in unison singing, but very rarely can be reached in part singing." Here is an opportunity for both choir and congregation. The effort to introduce some niceties of phrasing, to vary the steady rhythm of the metre by making the accent accommodate itself to the sense, will tend at once greatly to relieve the monotony of the unison song to the singers and to enhance the general effect of the performance. It is a kind of expression which is easily attainable, and more effective in unison than in part singing.

There are other ways in which monotony may be relieved. While the voices are singing in unison the organ may change the harmony from verse to verse, and in several other ways lend variety to the rendering. Then where a hymn has a refrain, variety may be introduced by getting the choir to sing some parts of the hymn by themselves, while the congregation strikes in with the refrain. Then while for some verses the choir sing in unison with the congregation, they may from time to time fill in the harmony. Sometimes the harmony may be of the simple kind provided in our hymnals, but at

[1] P. 14.

other times it may be of a more elaborate character, as in the Bach harmonisations of the chorales. Then still another method whereby the choir may be utilised to secure variety is the employment of what are known as Descant and Faux-Bourdon. There is some indefiniteness in the use of these terms, but according to Dr. Alan Gray [1] "the distinction between the two methods may be taken to be that in Descant a certain number of treble voices have an independent part, while the other voices sing the tune; in Faux-Bourdon the tune is placed in the tenor, while the other voices of the Choir sing round it in parts." This is a return to the method in which the Psalm-tunes were originally rendered, when the melody was given to the tenor, and the treble part consequently supplied a descant to it. Books may be procured giving descants and faux-bourdons for some of the best-known hymn-tunes, and one is glad to see that some of the recent hymnals have included a few such settings. It would take a little time for the congregation to get used to them, for it comes rather as a shock to find the sopranos, upon whom they have been relying to lead them in the singing of the air, soaring away into a quite different tune. And care must be taken that they are not allowed to overshadow the principal melody. But if they be kept duly subdued, and the principal melody be given out with no uncertain

[1] *A Book of Descants*, Preface.

sound while the descant or faux-bourdon hovers round it as a kind of barely perceptible aura, the effect is very fine ; and such a rendering would add greatly to the variety and interest of the congregational praise.

In the chanting of the Psalms the services of the choir are even more largely called into requisition than in the singing of hymns and metrical Psalms. For here the congregation stand much more in need of guidance and support. Indeed it is questionable whether chanting can ever become congregational in the same way as hymn singing. Even when the congregation have pointed Psalters in their hands, their participation is at best hesitating and sporadic. The difficulty presented by chanting as compared with hymn singing leads some authorities to discountenance the participation of the congregation altogether. Dr. Jebb, for instance, contends that we must choose definitively between the choral service and the congregational. " If the choral service is adopted," he says,[1] " let it be really such. If the congregational, then let metrical Psalms and hymns alone be sung (which admit more properly of the sustained and indiscriminate chorus, though even this is a question) but let Chants be laid aside, and the Psalms be simply recited." But it seems a pity to deprive the congregation of all participa-

[1] *The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland*, p. 300.

tion in this important department of the praise. The reference in Dr. Jebb's words to recitation by the congregation points to a method of performance which has not been taken advantage of as it might. If the congregation have difficulty in chanting, why should not the Psalms be recited as I have suggested in a previous lecture? After all, chanting is only a kind of reciting to a musical note. And it would be the best exercise a congregation could have for acquiring facility in chanting, if they were first to become proficient in the simultaneous recitation of the Psalms and Canticles. That is a stage that the choir itself has to go through in learning to chant. When the congregation has acquired proficiency in reciting the Psalms, the step to chanting might easily be taken.

The part played by the choir in the chanting is an important one because of the responsibility that devolves upon it. They have to appear much more in the foreground than in the singing of the hymns. If, as I think should be the case, it is desired to secure so far as possible the participation of the congregation, then the same consideration for its interests must be displayed as in the other departments of congregational praise. Care must be taken that the pace is not too quick. Far too often the recitation in the chant is but a gabble where it is impossible to distinguish one word from another. Clear and distinct enunciation, due recognition of the varying rhythm of the prose, intelligent interpretation of

the text—these are the features to be aimed at. The whole effort of the choir should be concentrated on making the meaning of the words as clear as possible. The music is entirely subsidiary, and it is the recognition of this that is one of the great excellences of the Gregorian chant. Where the Anglican chant is selected, endeavour should be made to overcome as much as possible the cast-iron rigidity of its musical scheme, and to make its time values as elastic and pliable as possible. If Gregorian chant be selected, then of course the choir will sing in unison. In the Anglican chant likewise there is much to be said in favour of unison singing. Whatever the reason, there seems little doubt that in unison singing we can secure a clearness of phrasing and interpretation beyond that usually attained in part singing ; and as these are precisely the features that are of the highest importance in chanting, it seems only reasonable that unison singing should be adopted. The interest of the performance of the Psalms is greatly enhanced where some antiphonal manner of performance is adopted. In the Church of England the two divisions of the choir which alternate in the performance of the verses of the Psalms are called Decani and Cantoris, from the two dignitaries, the Dean and the Precentor whose stalls are placed at opposite sides. The usual method of antiphonal performance is by the verse, not by the half verse, which would be more in accordance with the spirit of the text.

Hitherto I have spoken of the part played by the choir in leading the congregational praise. In cases where its numbers are small and its musical abilities slender, that will probably exhaust its functions. But where it is competent to make an independent contribution to the music of the service, it may serve to elevate the feelings and quicken the devotion of the worshippers to have some music introduced, the performance of which is entrusted to the choir alone. It should be quite clear to choir and worshippers that this part of the musical service is something entirely distinct from the rest: to the choir—that they may realise that their style of singing is to be entirely different from what it is when they are leading the praise of the congregation; and to the congregation—that they may understand that they are not expected to take any active part in the performance, but are merely to listen and submit themselves to the influence of the music.

There are certain recognised forms which music of a more elaborate character thus entrusted to the choir has assumed, of one or two of which I proceed to speak. Keeping to the limits I have already prescribed for these lectures, I shall not deal with the music of the Mass, but shall confine myself to the Protestant Church. Mendelssohn maintained that real Church music, i.e., music forming an integral part of the service, was impossible in Protestantism, and was half inclined to write a mass himself which,

as he said,[1] " whatever it might turn out, would at all events be the only mass written with a constant remembrance of its sacred purpose." But one need not accept such a low estimate either of the possibilities of Church music in Protestantism, or of its achievements under Roman Catholicism. It is quite true that it has not so important a place in the Protestant Church as it had before. But one has only to think of the Church Cantatas and Passions of the Lutheran Church and of the services and anthems of the Anglican, to realise that where the Puritan antipathy to music did not gain the upper hand, the Protestant Church could still utilise the service of music to a very considerable extent, and call into being works which are among the highest products of the art.

As these lectures are only in a minor degree historical, I do not propose to dwell at length upon the Church cantata which was one of the most characteristic products of Lutheranism. Still it may prove of interest to touch upon this interesting development, and explain how it came about that this novel musical form found a place in the Lutheran service. Strange as it may appear, Luther did not abolish the Mass altogether. Now the text of the Mass falls into two groups of chants which were distinguished as the *Proprium* and the *Ordinarium*. The former were so called because they had texts which

[1] Sebastian Henselt, *The Mendelssohn Family*, i. 325.

varied from time to time to suit the occasion, texts *proper* to the season, whereas the texts of the *Ordinarium* never varied. To this latter group belonged the *Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei.* These were retained in their entirety in the full choral service of the Lutheran Church. When the musical resources of the Church were limited, suitable hymns were substituted, e.g., "*Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr*" for the *Gloria,* "*Wir glauben all an einen Gott*" for the *Credo.* But where there was a capable choir, the original texts of the Mass were retained, and the first Protestant composers turned their hand to the composition of music for the Mass just like their Catholic predecessors. But with regard to the Proper of the Mass the situation was different. Certain portions of these were discarded, notably the specifically Catholic *Offertorium,* for which Luther substituted the sermon. In course of time it became the custom to introduce in the Gradual, another of the proper portions of the Mass, which came in between the Epistle and the Gospel, the verses of a German hymn proper to the season, and between the Gospel and the *Credo* on the one hand and between the *Credo* and the sermon on the other, hymns allotted to the choir, based upon the Gospel for the day. Here was a fresh opening for the composer which was gladly taken advantage of. The rendering being in the hands of the choir, this gave scope for elaboration of the music. The changing character of the text

offered a more attractive field for expression of the feelings than the stereotyped texts of the Ordinary of the Mass; and in course of time the Protestant musicians turned away from the weary iteration of the Ordinary to the composition of music for these sermon motets. This is the explanation from the liturgical side of the introduction of the motet, based upon the Gospel for the day, at this point in the service; and it is from this motet that the Church cantata gradually developed.

It remains to speak of the influences under which the music and the text assumed the form they did in the Bach Church cantatas. As regards the music, it is evident that a vast development has taken place. The old strict ecclesiastical style has given place to a much freer and more varied type of composition. In place of the unaccompanied chorus, we have now an alternation of chorus, solo aria, and recitative, with orchestral accompaniment. This was due to the influence of Italian opera. The pioneer of the new type of composition in Germany was Heinrich Schütz, who had been sent by his patron, the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Cassel, to study in Italy, and had there not only acquired great proficiency in the freer polyphony which his master Giovanni Gabrieli favoured, but also imbibed much of the spirit which Monteverde had breathed into Italian opera. The aim which Monteverde set before himself in opera was to make the music the vehicle for the dramatic expression of feeling. He broke through

the restraints which the musical precisians had enforced, and boldly perpetrated what to his contemporaries appeared the grossest harmonical monstrosities. By the freer treatment of discords which he championed, he was able to lend a passion and poignancy to music which it had never known before. These were the influences to which Schütz was subject during hisstay in Italy; and when he returned to Germany he brought with him, as equipment for the work to which he addressed himself, a freer polyphonic method and a livelier conception of the dramatic possibilities of music. These bore fruit in the Church music of the day, and gradually a new type of Church music came into being. It discarded the severity and aloofness of the old ecclesiastical style, the very purity of which was felt to be a defect. Protestantism demanded something warmer and more personal. It asserted the right of feeling to a place in religion. And this demand is attempted to be met in the new style of music. Music is now made more and more the vehicle of feeling. The orchestral accompaniment, the impassioned recitative, the vocal solo—these all lend a new warmth and life to Protestant Church music.

The question of the text to which the music of the sermon motet was to be composed was one of considerable difficulty. Schütz did not confine himself to texts bearing on the Gospel of the day, but drew boldly upon the whole Bible, arranging the passages he selected so far as possible in dramatic

form. And his practice seems to have had a considerable following. At a later date, just when Bach was approaching manhood, a Lutheran minister, Erdman Neumeister, issued a volume of *Kirchenandachten*, a series of poems designed to cover the whole year. He had composed them, he says, so as to incorporate the subjects treated in his sermons in a compact and connected form. They were accepted as the type of text most suitable for the cantata. Neumeister freely confessed that he had modelled his Church cantatas upon the opera, for to him a cantata was " nothing else than a portion of an opera, composed of *stylo recitativo* and aria together." The first cycle of cantatas was so popular that Neumeister was encouraged to produce four other series. In the first he confined himself to aria and recitative, without any Bible text, chorale verse, or chorus. But in the subsequent series hymns and Bible passages are introduced, and a place is given to the chorus. This type of cantata text encountered a considerable amount of opposition. Its frank recognition that the cantata was virtually a kind of sacred opera caused much offence. As Neumeister himself admitted, to many Church music and opera were as irreconcilable opposites as Christ and Belial, light and darkness. But in spite of all opposition the new type of cantata laid hold of the popular taste, and for a time held the field as the most serviceable kind of cantata text.

The outstanding name in connexion with German

Church cantatas is John Sebastian Bach. He is known to have composed close on 300 of which 198 have been preserved. To the musical public generally they are almost a *terra incognita*, to be reckoned among the *parerga* of Bach which all but the specialist can afford to neglect. But that is a very false estimate. They represent work upon which Bach must have been engaged almost continuously for some years of his life, work into which he poured forth his very soul and in which, in consequence, we seem to come into closer touch with him than in almost any other of his compositions with the exception, perhaps, of his Organ Chorale Preludes. When we consider the conditions under which they were written and performed, the marvel is to find the high standard consistently maintained. He had no thought of writing for a wider public; he made no effort to secure the dissemination of his cantatas. They were composed, as part of his official routine, to be performed on this or that Sunday or Feast Day by a small choir and orchestra with but little time for rehearsal; yet he puts into them such sound, honest work, he does what his hand finds to do so thoroughly with his might, that these, the ordinary output of the day's work are things "not of an age, but for all time." He was handicapped by the texts to which his music was composed. They were stilted and artificial, but in spite of their inferiority, he can make them the vehicle for some of his profoundest thoughts. The secret of the extraordinarily

high level of excellence maintained throughout the cantatas is to be found in the sincerely religious nature of the man. His religion was of a practical character, and taught him to do whatever he did to the glory of God. The S.D.G. (*Soli Deo Gloria*) and the J.J. (*Jesu Juva*), which are plentifully sprinkled over the scores of his works, are no empty formulæ, but indicate the spirit in which he addressed himself to his work, feeling that by his art he is truly glorifying God. A devout believer, he welcomes the seasons and festivals of the Church Year as making appeal to the deepest instincts of his being. Small wonder that there was nothing perfunctory in the music with which he greeted them, or that he should have converted work which, to a less spiritually minded man, might have seemed a piece of official drudgery, into a labour of love upon which he lavished all the resources of his art in order that he might lay the most costly sacrifice upon the divine altar. It is a case of deep calling to deep, the response of a deeply religious nature to the appeal of the sublime mysteries of religion. "His Christmas music," says Dr. Whittaker,[1] "is a pæan of ecstasy; his Holy Week music moves in deep and personal anguish; his Easter music is triumphant and exulting; his Whitsun music glows with fire. But in all his expressions of these thousand-and-one emotions

[1] *Fugitive Notes on some Cantatas and the Motets of J. S. Bach*, p. 30.

there was no narrow-mindedness, no insularity begotten of creed. However far we may have travelled from the faith of Bach, however few of his theological views we can endorse, there is in him such a splendid humanity, such an intense sympathy with his fellow-men, there is such a personal revelation of self in his writings, and they are clothed in such noble forms of the purest type of beauty, that they touch our heartstrings with the utmost intimacy, they give us continual mental refreshment and glimpses into the infinite."

A good many of Bach's cantatas are composed to the Neumeister type of text. But in his later life he seems to have been attracted to a different type, based more closely on the chorale. The words, and in the case of his later cantatas the melody also of the chorale, are taken as the material to be worked up in the cantata. Various methods of treatment are adopted. The first chorus is generally based upon the chorale tune, the chorus singing it line by line with instrumental interludes between the lines, or weaving an ingenious counterpoint composed of fragments of the melody round the chorale tune, which is given out by one of the vocal parts or by the instruments. The last chorus is likewise generally a verse of the chorale, but this time treated in quite a different fashion, being sung through in simple four-part harmony, the instruments doubling the various parts. The middle section is made up of recitative and solos, the text being a paraphrase

of some of the intervening verses of the chorale in a form more suited for treatment as a solo, the music being sometimes based upon the chorale tune, sometimes a free composition. This chorale type of cantata is, as I have said, the kind to which Bach mainly devoted himself in his later days. It is but another proof of the strong hold that the chorale laid upon him. His heart seems to leap up in response to its appeal, and his touch is never surer or his pathos more tender than when he draws inspiration from the sacred melodies so dear to his heart.

I turn now to speak of the more elaborate music assigned to the choir in the Church of England, the other Protestant Church which, as we have seen, preserved the thread of musical continuity, in respect both of choir and musical service, at the Reformation. It is specially of the Church Service and anthem that I wish to speak, but before we turn to them it may be of interest to preface a few words on the Cathedral or Choral Service of the Church of England generally. As we have seen, the tendency on the part of the authorities in England at the time of the Reformation was to minimise rather than to emphasise the difference between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Church. As few changes were made in the service as possible, and such disputes and altercations as arose with regard to the music were not between Protestant and Catholic, but between ritualist and Puritan on the Protestant side. The service which the Church of England took

over from the Catholic Church was essentially a musical service, and for its adequate performance it requires on the part of those to whom it is entrusted a considerable amount of musical skill. Strictly speaking the choir includes the whole body of the clergy, who are supposed to take part in the Ecclesiastical Chant, and the part of the Church which they occupy along with the inferior members is called the choir. The full musical service is known as the Cathedral or Choral Service. There are two other types of service in use, the Parochial Service, where all parts of the Liturgy are recited in speaking voice, and another type, which might be called the Mixed Mode, which introduces as much music from the Choral Service as is compatible with the resources of the choir. The main features of the Choral Service are thus set forth by Dr. Jebb :—[1]

" 1. The Chanting by the Minister of the sentences, exhortations, prayers, and Collects throughout the Liturgy, in a monotone, slightly varied by occasional modulations.

" 2. The alternate Chant of the Versicles and Responses by the Minister and Choir.

" 3. The alternate Chant, by the two divisions of the Choir, of the daily Psalms, and of such as occur in the various offices of the Church.

" 4. The singing of all the Canticles and Hymns, in the Morning and Evening service, either to an

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 156.

alternated Chant, or to a more intricate style of Song, resembling Anthems in their construction, and which are technically styled ' Services.'

" 5. The singing of the Anthem after the third Collect both in Morning and Evening Prayer.

" 6. The alternate Chanting of the Litany, by the Minister and Choir.

" 7. The singing of the Responses after the Commandments in the Communion office.

" 8. The singing of the Nicene Creed, the Sanctus, and Gloria in Excelsis in the Communion Service Anthem-wise.

" 9. The Chanting or singing of those parts in the occasional offices, which are rubrically permitted to be sung."

Evidently the outstanding feature of this service is the Chant (using the word in the widest sense, as embracing the priestly monotone), which indeed forms the basis of the whole performance. It is not reserved only for the Psalms and Canticles, but is used throughout the whole service with the exception of the Lessons. We have seen that when used in the Psalms it was antiphonal in character. So it is likewise in the prayers, the alternation being between the minister or priest, on the one side, and the choir, as representing the people, on the other.

The Plain Chant of the Roman Catholic Church was carried over into the Church of England, and adapted to English words. Cranmer published an edition of the Litany in English in 1544, " for every

syllable a note, so that it may be sung distinctly and devoutly;" and in 1550 appeared John Merbecke's musical setting of the Prayer Book. Merbecke was the organist of St. George's Chapel, Windsor. He was arrested for heresy towards the end of Henry VIII.'s reign, and condemned to the stake, but managed to obtain a pardon. His "Booke of Common praier noted" was an adaptation of old Gregorian Chant to the first liturgy of Edward VI. on the principle advocated by Cranmer of a note for every syllable. Merbecke's setting justly enjoyed great popularity, and has held its place to the present day. It was in unison throughout. In due course the demand arose for a harmonised musical service, and among the earliest to appear was Tallis's in the Dorian mode. Further developments were the gradual evolution of the harmonised Anglican chant from the unison Gregorian with its free rhythm, and the elaboration of certain parts of the musical service from the simple chant form which they had originally assumed into the anthem-like setting technically known as Service. The Service of the Church of England embraces the following numbers, though some are sometimes omitted: The "*Venite*" (Ps. xcv.), "*Te Deum*," "*Benedicite*" (The Song of the Three Children, taken from the Greek continuation of Dan. iii.), "*Benedictus*" (Song of Zacharias), "*Jubilate*" (Ps. c.), "*Kyrie eleison*," "*Nicene Creed*," "*Sanctus*," "*Gloria in excelsis*," "*Magnificat*" (Song of Mary), "*Cantate Domino*"

(Ps. xcviii.), "*Nunc dimittis*" (Song of Simeon), and the "*Deus misereatur*" (Ps. lxvii.). In these Services and in the anthem, of which I shall speak presently, scope was given to the musical powers of the composer. They have inspired some of the highest flights of musical genius; they have also, I fear, provoked some of the sorriest hackwork that was ever perpetrated. There are many names, particularly among the musicians of the Tudor period, of whose work we have every reason to be proud. Even at the time when Palestrina in Italy raised Church music to its highest pitch, there were men in England who were not unworthy to be placed alongside of him. "This has been the common error, as I humbly conceive," says Archbishop Laud, "of the English nation, to entertain and value strangers in all professions of learning beyond their desert, and to the contempt or passing by, at the least, of men of equal worth of their own nation." When we think of such men as Tye, Whyte, Tallis, Byrd, Farrant, Gibbons, and of a later date, Purcell, we have no need to be ashamed of the place English music has won for itself in the past.

The anthem is another characteristic feature of the musical service of the Church of England. It made its appearance in the sixteenth century, and according to Dr. Walker,[1] "is a fusion of three different streams—the harmonised antiphon (from

[1] "*History of Music in England*, p. 37.

which its name is derived), the harmonised 'sequence,' and the elaborate psalm-settings, half-way between chants and anthems, which we find in the works of Byrd and Gibbons and other post-Reformation composers." It differs from the Service which we have just been considering in that the text is not fixed, the rubric merely running: "In Quires and Places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem." As a general rule the words are taken from Scripture or the Liturgy; occasionally, however, they are in metrical form. As we saw that liturgically the German Church Cantata corresponded to the Proper of the Mass, so we may regard the Anglican Service with its fixed text as the counterpart of the Ordinary, and the anthem without any prescribed text as that of the Proper of the Mass; for while the text of the anthem is left free, it is only right that due care should be exercised to choose something appropriate to the season of the ecclesiastical year, or to some portion of the service of the day. Musically anthems are distinguished as Full and Verse anthems, the former employing the whole body of singers throughout, the latter containing portions which are assigned to solo voices either in combination or alone, in which case they are sometimes called Solo Anthems.[1]

[1] "Nothing can dissuade me from the notion, that many of the Psalms of David were, at least during the life of their inspired composer, often sung after the manner of our Verse Anthems; that there was the alternation of solo,

The Service and the anthem supply the forms within which vocal Church music in England has had to realise itself. They have reflected the changing features and tendencies of musical taste. During the period immediately succeeding the Reformation the polyphonic style was in the ascendant, and this was the form in which the first anthems and Services were composed. It was a style of music that had its origin within the Church, and there can be no doubt as to its essentially ecclesiastical character. There is a solemn dignity about the music of this period which, if it sometimes borders on austerity, has always a purity and grave charm about it which cannot fail to make appeal to those who cherish high ideals of the offering which the art of music lays upon the divine altar. As I have said, it was likewise a time at which England could boast of musicians worthy to be placed alongside of even the highest of their continental contemporaries. The anthems and Services which have been handed down from them are works of the first rank; and the Church of England was fortunate in possessing from the beginning musicians who set a high standard for the musical service, and inaugurated a tradition which was to exercise an elevating influence upon succeeding generations. The outstanding names of

verse, and chorus; the internal structure of the Psalms themselves, and the names of the instruments employed for their accompaniment, suggesting this idea" (Jebb, *loc. cit.*, p. 378).

the polyphonic period are those I have already named, down to Orlando Gibbons, with whom this period may be said to have come to an end. For the most part the anthems of this period are of the Full variety, though there are a few instances of Verse. As there is no independent instrumental accompaniment we are inclined to suppose that they would be performed unaccompanied, as they are usually rendered nowadays. But it was the custom in these times to support the voices by viols doubling the vocal part. "Apt for viols and voices" is a legend frequently met with on the title-pages of music of this period, and according to Dr. Walker,[1] "there seems, indeed, no doubt that the 'full' anthems and services which are now sung unaccompanied were formerly supported all through by viols in unison and also by the organ, at any rate so far as the top and bottom parts and the chief 'leads' of the others were concerned."

The next important era in the development of Church music in England is the period of the Restoration. During the Commonwealth the Cathedral services were suppressed, the choirs were disbanded, and in some cases the organs were burned. With the Restoration came the reaction, but the line of continuity had been to a certain extent broken. During the Puritan interregnum music, driven from the Church, had been diverted into secular channels,

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 64.

and when the door was again opened for its admission, it found that it could no longer resume at the point at which it had left off. A change had come over the musical taste of the time. The gravity of the earlier music no longer appealed. The influence of the Court likewise contributed to the development of a different style in Church music. Charles II., that "brisk and airy Prince," had acquired a liking for the new French music during his residence abroad. He sent the most promising of the musicians of the Chapel Royal, Pelham Humphrey, to study in Paris under Lully, with the object of introducing into the music of the Church something of the more expressive and declamatory style of the new French school. The result was that a new type of Church music came into vogue. The Full Anthem gave place to the Verse, with occasional solos. The new resources in the way of declamatory expression opened up by the introduction of the solo were exploited to the full. In speaking of Verse Anthems Dr. Jebb declares [1] that "it was from the progress of taste, which is a plant of slow growth, not from the encroachments of a secular spirit, that the graces unknown to the more ancient music of Europe, were adopted into the Church." When we recall how much the influence of "the merry monarch" had to do with the adoption of the new style, we may question Dr. Jebb's protests in regard

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 378.

to the encroachments of a secular spirit. In deference to the likings of the King, violins were now for the first time introduced into the Church. The anthem was broken up into various sections, with elaborate *ritornelli* for the instruments between, "better suiting a tavern, or playhouse, than a Church," wrote Evelyn when he first heard them. This, then, was the new style of Church music that came into being at the Restoration. That there was some loss, as compared with the former style, is evident. The severe dignity and restraint of the polyphonic school were to a great extent lost. Lost also was the coherence, the sense of organic unity which characterised the older style of anthem. The anthem had now become a collection of separate chorus and solo numbers connected by instrumental interludes often of considerable length and of doubtful relevancy. But while there is loss in this respect, there is gain in the warmer colour and the richer opportunity for expression afforded by the less severe character of the music and the new resources opened up by the use of the solo. And there were not wanting musicians of the highest endowments to take full advantage of the opportunity thus presented. Pelham Humphrey, Blow, Henry Purcell, and somewhat later Croft and Jeremiah Clarke are among the outstanding names, the greatest, of course, being Henry Purcell who holds perhaps the foremost place among English musicians. His anthems exhibit the characteristics of the period to which I have

referred, want of coherence, elaborate instrumental interludes, occasional secularity of tone. But in spite of such declension from the stricter ecclesiastical style, there is a purity and a strength manifest throughout, occasionally such massive power in the choral writing and such declamatory fire in the solos, as entitle his compositions to be ranked among the highest productions of our English Church music.

Of the further history of the anthem it is unnecessary to speak. Its later development, if one can indeed speak of development where there has been no striking out in any new direction through change of form, has been along the lines laid down by the composers of the Restoration era. Some of the excrescences and blemishes of the form of that period have been modified or corrected. The orchestra, which had been introduced in deference to Court influence, was soon abandoned save in the case of festival compositions. With it disappeared the long instrumental *ritornelli* which had contributed so much to lack of coherence. The florid declamatory passages assigned to the solo voices likewise disappeared. The exuberance of feeling, which revelled in the wealth of opportunity opened up by the introduction of the solo, gradually became more chastened. The influence of foreign composers such as Handel, and at a later date Mendelssohn, Spohr, and Gounod, is distinctly traceable in much of the Church music emanating from contemporaries. There are many names worthy of note among later

composers who have enriched the Church with good, solid music worthily carrying on the traditions of the past. There are countless others who have flooded our Church libraries with anthems and Services, regarding which we may say as Hawkins said of King's works: "No one cares to censure or commend them, and they leave the mind just as they found it." But taking the music of the Church of England as a whole we may say, even in the face of the vast mass of mediocrity which has accumulated in its later history, that it presents a rich storehouse upon which to draw for the enhancement of divine worship, and that in its noblest flights it rises at times to the highest pitch of musical achievement.

While the Church Service and the anthem are products of the Cathedral Service of the Church of England, they have to a certain extent been received into the worship of other Churches. Not of course the Church Service in its fulness, which is proper only to the liturgy of the Church of England; but certain of the Canticles which are not peculiar to it, and which are gladly incorporated by other Churches into their service, and likewise the anthem which provides an opportunity for the choir to make an independent contribution to the musical side of the worship. With regard to the Canticles there is a feeling on the part of some Church authorities that it is undesirable to deprive the congregation of participation in them by adopting the anthem setting of the Service. Where this feeling exists, the

Canticles will be rendered in chant form. This is the manner in which they were originally sung. Where Gregorian chant is practised, the ancient melody for the "*Te Deum*," known as the Ambrosian "*Te Deum*," may be selected. Sometimes a compromise is effected by selecting an anthem setting of such popular type as the congregation may take part in. It does not seem a judicious measure, as to my mind a clear line should be drawn between choir music and congregational music, and any attempt to combine the two can only lead to musical chaos. And when the attempted compromise results, as is only too probable, in the selection of such a piece of musical ineptitude as the well-known Jackson "*Te Deum*," one feels that, apart from the artistic ineffectiveness of such co-operation of choir and congregation, the participation of the latter is purchased at too dear a price by the admission of such unworthy music into the service. While as a general rule it may be desirable to have the Canticles rendered in chant form in order that the congregation may participate, there are special festival occasions upon which it is fitting that the more elaborate setting should be adopted; and there are certain churches, such for instance as our Scottish Cathedrals, where the musical powers of the choir are such as to justify the regular employment of such setting. It is well, I think, that even in our Scottish Churches there should be something corresponding in a minor degree to the distinction between

the Cathedral and the Parochial Service of the Church of England. The more elaborate musical service may not appeal to every one. But there are some to whom it does afford edification and spiritual refreshment; and while some may feel that the anthem setting of the Canticles deprives them of the participation they desire, there are others who derive more spiritual quickening from the more elaborate music rendered by the choir than they would from actual participation themselves. With the great wealth of music upon which to draw for such setting of the Canticles, it seems only proper that some provision should be made for these as well.

But while there are comparatively few cases where this method of rendering the Canticles may be adopted as a general rule, there are large numbers of our churches in which an anthem is rendered by the choir as part of the ordinary service. As I have already said, this is something quite distinct from the congregational praise,—an independent contribution by the choir. Here is their opportunity to display all that refinement and delicacy of expression which they are ready to forgo when they are leading the congregational praise. There is a wide field upon which to draw, and the choirmaster's first care should be to make sure that the music he selects is worthy to be performed as part of divine worship. Unfortunately there is a great deal of very poor material ready at hand, music of a sentimental character with no flavour of the Church about it,

making appeal by its cheap effects and its tawdry showiness. But there is also, as we have seen, some of the soundest, noblest music that the genius of our English composers has brought forth. Of course much of the very best is far beyond the powers of the ordinary choir. But even for a choir of comparatively restricted powers, there is a rich field of solid, devout music available. The mistake is often made of choosing something beyond the abilities of the choir. Far better that the choice be of something simple and thoroughly within their powers, that the effort which is so often expended in attempting some difficulty at the extreme limit of their ability be directed rather towards enriching with expression the music the mere notes of which are easily within their compass. A choir even of very moderate ability may give such a rendering of a simple anthem, by concentrating on purity of tone and delicacy of expression, as may go home to the hearts of the hearers in a way a more ambitious effort may fail to do. Let it never be forgotten that the performance of the anthem is an integral part of the worship. Let the choir sing not to display their powers but to carry the message of the music to the hearts of the worshippers. Let the congregation listen not as to a performance at a concert, but as longing to have their hearts moved to deeper devotion by the strains in which the words of Holy Scripture are charged with a richer meaning. Where such is the spirit in which the anthem is sung and listened to, it will not fail to justify its claim to inclusion in the service.

LECTURE VI.

THE ORGAN.

Among primitive peoples the use of some form of instrumental music in religious worship was very general. The religious procession with symbolic dance and choral song was an outstanding feature of the ritual, and for this the service of instrumental music was largely called into requisition. The monuments of ancient Egypt and Assyria have many representations of these sacred processions, in which a variety of instruments are depicted. In addition to the purpose they served by supporting the song and giving the rhythm for the dance, the instruments would likewise exercise a certain influence upon the feelings, and tend to the stimulation of the nervous excitement, and the heightening of the emotion of awe or joy or sorrow suited to the occasion. Among the Hebrews instrumental music was likewise in general use. Miriam and the women go out to meet Moses, after the crossing of the Red Sea, with timbrels and dances. Saul on his departure from Samuel meets with a company of prophets marching along with a psaltery and a tabret

and a pipe and a harp. The musical arrangements in the temple were on a most elaborate scale. The instruments employed were cymbals, two kinds of stringed instruments, distinguished in the Authorised Version as psalteries and harps, and trumpets which were played by the priests alone. According to the Book of Chronicles 4000 were appointed to praise the Lord with instruments (1 Chron. xxiii. 5). These are large figures, but they pale into insignificance beside those of Josephus, who records that Solomon provided 200,000 trumpets and 40,000 psalteries and harps (*Ant.*, viii. 3, 8). One wonders what the physical effect of such an orchestra would have been, had it ever existed anywhere but in the imagination of the historian.

In the early Christian Church there was, however, a strong feeling against the use of instruments in divine worship. Some have thought to account for this by the secrecy which the Christians had to adopt for their gatherings for worship, on account of the persecution to which they were exposed. But if that had been the reason, it would have silenced the voice of song as well. Yet in spite of the persecution which made the infant Church hide "her head 'mid ignominy, death, and tombs," vocal music seems to have been a regular part of the ritual. We must seek the explanation of the opposition to musical instruments in worship in some other direction; and from the attitude of the Fathers it is not difficult to find it. It arose from

the desire to make the gulf which separated Christianity from heathenism as wide as possible. The instruments which might have been called into use in divine worship were, to the early Christians, inseparably associated with heathen religious rites and theatrical performances of a debasing character. Clement of Alexandria would have musical instruments banished not merely from the worship but also from the feasts of Christians. He regarded them as being more suitable to beasts than men. "For we have heard," he says,[1] "of stags being charmed by the pipe, and seduced by music into the toils, when hunted by the huntsman. We must be on our guard against whatever pleasure titillates eye and ear, and effeminates. For the various spells of the broken strains and plaintive melodies of the Carian muse corrupt men's morals, drawing to perturbation of mind, by the licentious and mischievous art of music." Jerome thought that a Christian maiden ought not even to know what a lyre or a flute was, or what it was used for. The first believers were little concerned about the artistic quality of their performance. The spirit of ecstasy and perfervid enthusiasm in which they poured forth their feelings was to them a matter of far more importance than the sweetness or tunefulness of their song. "We sing God's praises," says Eusebius,[2] "with living psaltery, inspired cithara and

[1] *Pædag.*, ii. 4.

[2] *In Psalm.* 91.

spiritual songs. Far more pleasant and dear to God than any instrument is the harmony of the whole Christian people, when in all the Churches of Christ we sing psalms and hymns with harmonious minds and well-tuned hearts." And again: "Our cithara is the whole body, by whose movement and action the soul sings a fitting hymn to God, and our ten-stringed psaltery is the veneration of the Holy Ghost by the five senses of the body and the five virtues of the spirit." Similarly the references in Scripture to the use of musical instruments are interpreted by Clement of Alexandria as referring to the various organs of the body. It may be of interest to give the passage as a specimen of patristic allegorisation: "The Spirit, distinguishing from such revelry the divine service, sings, 'Praise Him with sound of trumpet;' for with sound of trumpet He shall raise the dead. 'Praise Him on the psaltery;' for the tongue is the psaltery of the Lord. 'And praise Him on the lyre.' By the lyre is meant the mouth struck by the Spirit, as it were, by a plectrum. 'Praise with the timbrel and the dance,' refers to the Church meditating on the resurrection of the dead in the resounding skin. 'Praise Him on the chords and organ.' Our body He calls an organ, i.e., an instrument, and its nerves are the strings, by which it has received harmonious tension, and when struck by the Spirit, it gives forth human voices. 'Praise Him on the clashing cymbals.' He calls the tongue the cymbal of the mouth, which

resounds with the pulsation of the lips. Therefore he cried to humanity, 'Let every breath praise the Lord,' because He cares for every breathing thing which He hath made. For man is truly a pacific instrument; while other instruments, if you investigate, you will find to be warlike, inflaming to lusts, or kindling up amours, or rousing wrath." [1] Some of the Fathers took up the position that the introduction of musical instruments into the temple service was a concession to the carnality of the Jews. So Chrysostom: "It was only permitted to the Jews as sacrifice was, for the heaviness and grossness of their souls. God condescended to their weakness, because they were lately drawn off from idols: but now instead of instruments, we may use our own bodies to praise Him withal."

The organ, which was the instrument destined ultimately to establish itself as peculiarly fitted for use in Church worship, is of considerable antiquity. The germ from which it was to develop was the syrinx or Pan's pipe, a set of reeds of various lengths bound together in a row with their open tops arranged in a horizontal line, so that the player by shifting it about, as it was held to the mouth, could produce sounds of varying pitch. In course of time the idea suggested itself that instead of the player shifting the pipes about as he blew down them, it would be better to introduce the wind from below,

[1] *Pædag.*, ii. 4.

and to have some arrangement whereby it could be admitted to the pipe one desired to sound and excluded from the others. The form of organ in use in ancient times was known as the hydraulic organ, the principle of which was devised by an Egyptian of the third century B.C. called Ctesibius. It received its name from the fact that the supply of wind to the pipes was regulated by an ingenious water arrangement. The instrument so constructed by Ctesibius was improved by Archimedes, and called forth the admiration of Tertullian: "Observe the extraordinary genius of Archimedes. I speak of the hydraulus. What members, what parts, what joinings, what rows of pipes, what a compendium of sounds, what an intercourse of modes, what troops of *tibiæ*, and all composing one great whole! That spirit, which breathes from the trouble of the waters, is administered through the parts, is solid in substance, divided in operation."

The hydraulic organ came in course of time to give place to the pneumatic. The difference between the two kinds of organ is not very well brought out by these designations, as one might be led to infer that the part played by air in the pneumatic instrument in sounding the pipes was taken by water in the hydraulic. But that was not the case. The water in the hydraulic instrument did not go near the pipes. The hydraulic organ, so far as the sounding of the pipes was concerned, was as truly pneumatic as the so-called pneumatic. The water was

used merely to regulate the wind pressure, the inequality of which was one of the great difficulties in organ construction. In the pneumatic instrument water was dispensed with, and the difficulty about the regulation of the wind pressure was met by multiplying the number of bellows. I have quoted Tertullian's eulogy of the hydraulic organ. It may be of interest to have a similar encomium of the pneumatic instrument, this time in an epigram attributed to Julian the Apostate : " I see a strange sort of reeds—they must, methinks, have sprung from no earthly, but a brazen soil. Wild are they, nor does the breath of man stir them, but a blast, leaping forth from a cavern of ox-hide, passes within, beneath the roots of the polished reeds ; while a lordly man, the fingers of whose hands are nimble, stands and touches here and there the concordant stops of the pipes ; and the stops, as they lightly rise and fall, force out the melody." [1]

The Greek Church does not tolerate instrumental music of any kind in worship, and its doors were closed to the organ. Of the date of the introduction of the instrument into the Western Church we cannot say anything with certainty. We read of an organ being sent by the Byzantine Emperor, Constantine Copronymus, to King Pepin in the year 757, and this is sometimes taken as the date of its introduction to the West. But organs seem to have been known

[1] *Palatine Anthology*, Bk. IX., No. 365.

in Spain and Italy long before this. According to Julianus, a Spanish bishop who lived in the fifth century, the organ was in common use in the churches of that country in his day. Some authorities have it that Pope Vitalianus, who lived in the seventh century, introduced the instrument into the Church in Italy. It is difficult to reach any certainty in the matter; but Ambros,[1] an eminent authority on the history of music, is of opinion that the use of small organs in church may be dated much earlier than is generally supposed. Charlemagne had one built for the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle, and by the tenth century organs were installed in most of the cathedrals and larger churches.

We are accustomed to think of the organ as the instrument specially associated with Church worship. But originally it was used for secular entertainment, and a writer of the fifth century praises Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, for having none at his court. Chaucer[2] speaks of the "mery orgon," even when referring to its use in the church, which is hardly the epithet we should employ; but as we shall see, it was sometimes used in the Mass to introduce strains of a far from sacred character. The first organs employed in church were very unwieldy, cumbersome structures. The keys were from four to six inches broad, and had to be struck by the

[1] *Gesch. der Musik*, ii. 75.
[2] *The Nonne Priestes Tale*, 4041.

fists or the elbows. Hence the expression " to beat the organ." The tone was harsh and piercing, and we read of a woman in the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle falling into a faint, or if we press the literal translation of the Latin, losing her life, at the sound. The following account of a gigantic organ installed in Winchester Cathedral in the tenth century is of interest: " Twice six bellows above are ranged in a row, and fourteen lie below. These, by alternate blasts, supply an immense quantity of wind, and are worked by seventy strong men, labouring with their arms, covered with perspiration, each inciting his companions to drive the wind up with all his strength, that the full-bosomed box may speak with its four hundred pipes which the hand of the organist governs. . . . Two brethren of concordant spirit sit at the instrument, and each manages his own alphabet (i.e., octave). . . . Like thunder the iron tones batter the ear, so that it may receive no sound but that alone. To such an amount does it reverberate, echoing in every direction, that every one stops with his hand his gaping ears, being in no wise able to draw near and hear the sound, which so many combinations produce. The music is heard throughout the town, and the flying fame thereof is gone out over the whole country." [1] If the organ at Aix-la-Chapelle was anything like this, one does

[1] Wulstan, translation from Wackerbarth, *Music and the Anglo-Saxons*, p. 12.

not wonder at the collapse of the woman at the sound.

I do not propose to give any account of the gradual development of the organ from the clumsy, unwieldy instrument I have described to the state of perfection it has now attained. There is just one point to which I would draw attention, for it casts light upon a most important development in music, nothing less in short than the origin of that polyphony which was to create such an enormous advance in the history of the art. Up to the Middle Ages vocal music had been entirely in unison. The first efforts at polyphony were of the crudest character. They consisted in two voices of different pitch—say at the distance of a fifth or a fourth from each other—each singing the same melody, the two parts thus running parallel at the interval between the voices, or the lower part holding one note as a kind of drone while the other part sang the melody. To our ears the former method would sound atrocious, even in spite of the efforts of modern composers to reconcile us to consecutive fifths. But crude and discordant as it was, it was the germ from which the marvels of counterpoint were to develop. This species of singing received the name "*organum*," and the performers were said to "organise." Even to the present day in Spain *canto de organo* means harmonised vocal music, as opposed to unison plainsong. It is sometimes difficult in reading mediæval writers to decide whether, when they speak of

organum, they are referring to the instrument or to this elementary part singing. Now how did this species of singing come to receive the name *organum ?* There is no certain evidence on the point ; but it is a plausible conjecture that it was so named after the instrument on which it had been discovered that two notes accidentally sounded together by the two hands produced a pleasing combination. In course of time when the *organum* had become established as a regular practice in vocal music, it was realised that it was possible to have the organ so constructed that one key should sound two pipes, one a fourth or a fifth above the other, or three pipes, the third adding the octave ; and this was the origin of the mixture stop which is still a feature in the organ. If it be the case, as the name seems to suggest, that the organ was the source from which polyphony sprang, it is interesting to note how amply the offspring has repaid the debt ; for there can be no question that the polyphonic style of music is that best suited to the genius of the organ. Thus the new art, which was to win its first triumphs in the field of vocal music, returned in due time to the source from which it sprang, to develop to richer fulness the resources of the instrument.

As we have seen, during the Middle Ages the organ was being gradually introduced and more and more freely used, at any rate in the larger churches. It is only natural that the spirit which resisted its introduction should be found giving itself expression,

even when it was fairly firmly established. An English abbot of the twelfth century, Ælred of Riveaulx, compares the blowing of the bellows to the crashing of thunder. But he was out of sympathy with any attempt to elaborate the music of the service, and makes mock of the singers with their deep breaths, their open mouths, their alternations in quality of tone, now an outburst like the neighing of a horse, now a fading away to the thinness of a woman's voice, their postures and contortions and grimaces, more like actors in a theatre than men engaged in the worship of God; with all of which he contrasts the mode of singing which the Holy Ghost introduced by His organs, the holy Fathers of old, Augustine, Ambrose, and especially Gregory.[1] Thomas Aquinas likewise protested against the introduction of the organ. "Such instruments," he says, "serve rather to cause pleasure than to awaken devotion. They are introduced in the Old Testament because the people were crass and obdurate, and required to be stimulated by such instruments as by earthly promises."[2] And he says expressly that the Church does not permit musical instruments, such as zithers and psalteries, in order that it may not be like the Jews. From this we should conclude that in the churches with which he was acquainted the organ cannot have been in use. This may quite

[1] *Speculum caritatis*, lib. ii. cap. 23.
[2] *Tract.*, 2, 2, *quaest.* 91, Art. 2.

well have been the case, as we know that in the Church of Lyons, for instance, the introduction of the organ was barred by the canon: "*Ecclesia Lugdunensis novitates non recipit.*" Similarly the organ has never been admitted into the Sistine Chapel. But in spite of protest and occasional refusal to admit it, it gradually made its way into the Church and received a definite place in the service.

We turn now to consider what that place was. How was the organ used when it was first admitted into the Church?

The first use to which it was put was to give the note to the priest and the choir for their intonation. In course of time, when the instrument was improved, the organist would venture to go further than the simple tone, and would play the opening phrase of the music to follow. This led on to what was called the Preamble, and this was later to develop into the more elaborate Prelude. Further, the organ was used to accompany, to some extent at any rate, the singing of the choir. This seems to have been the case especially with such choral numbers as were concerned with the praise of God, such, e.g., as the "*Sanctus*" and "*Hosanna.*" These uses of the organ are fairly obvious. But there is another way in which it was employed which strikes us as strange, and of which it may prove interesting to give some detailed account. This was to make the playing of the organ alternate with, instead of

accompanying, the singing of the choir. By the sixteenth century this was the established custom. Luther tells us in his "Table Talk" that once when he was a monk he came to a village to celebrate Mass, and when he went up to the altar he could hardly keep from laughing when the sacristan began to play the "*Kyrie eleison*" and "*Patrem*" on a lute, for he was not used to that kind of organ-playing. What seems to have amused Luther was not the rendering of a certain portion of the Mass on an instrument, but the naïveté of the sacristan in making use of the lute, which was used for secular music, to take the place of the absent organ. One writer,[1] speaking of the different methods in which organ and choir may co-operate, tells us that one way was for the organ to play the first verse of the canticle or psalm and the choir to sing the remainder straight through (*uno contextu*), another for the choir and the organ to render alternate verses. This latter method he prefers, as it keeps the mind from wandering, and gives less opportunity for chattering. He suggests that when the verse is being played by the organ, the choir should fill in the words in subdued tones and each member for himself (*submissa voce et singulatim*). At the Synod of Kulm in 1605 it was decreed that in the portions assigned to the

[1] Martinus Azpilcueta Navarrus, *Commentarii et Tractatus*, cap. 21, p. 293 s. Quoted, Rietschel, *Die Aufgabe der Orgel im Gottesdienste*, p. 13.

organ, a single member of the choir should recite the words corresponding to the music.

While this method of having choir and organ perform in alternation was in general use in the sixteenth century and recognised by the ecclesiastical authorities, there were, as we learn from the decisions of some Synods and Councils, certain limits assigned to it. The Synod of Cambray in 1565 laid down the principle that whatever portion of the musical service was designed for instruction should be rendered by the choir alone and not by the organ, which could not edify like the living voice which is the interpreter and messenger of the Spirit. The number that was pre-eminently debarred to the organ on this principle was the "*Credo*." Different Councils differed in their decisions as to what other parts of the Mass should be reserved for the choir.

A definite pronouncement as to the place assigned to the organ in the Roman Catholic service at the end of the sixteenth century is made in the "Cæremoniale" drawn up by Pope Clement VIII. in the year 1600. In Matins it co-operates with the choir in the "*Te Deum*," and in Vespers in the "*Magnificat*," the choir commencing and the organ following. In the Versicles the organ is to keep silence and the choir to sing alone. The "*Gloria patri*," etc., with which the "*Introit*" concludes, is likewise to be rendered by the choir alone, also the last verses of the hymns. In the other canonical hours it is not customary for the organ to participate; but if this

takes place, it is recommended that one member of the choir recite in a clear voice what the organ is rendering. In the Mass the organ is to alternate with the choir in the "*Kyrie eleison*," the "*Gloria in excelsis*," and various other numbers. At the elevation of the host the organ is to play devoutly and quietly. In the "*Credo*" the organ is to remain silent and the choir is to sing alone.

While the organ was thus securing for itself a recognised place in divine service, there were not wanting protests against certain abuses which followed on its introduction. Complaint was made that in their desire to show off their powers the organists sometimes spun out the service to an hour longer than the usual time. Or sometimes the complaint was to the opposite effect, that the organ was used to rush through in the shortest possible time the various portions of the Mass which would have taken much longer to sing. Still worse, the organists were blamed for introducing secular, sometimes even lascivious and obscene, melodies into the Mass. This was one of the abuses specially dealt with by the Council of Trent.[1] As Schweitzer says:[2] "Catholics and Protestants alike at that time imposed on it [the organ] a term of penance, in order

[1] "Ab ecclesiis musicas eas ubi sive organo, sive cantu lascivum aut impurum aliquid miscetur item seculares omnes actiones . . . arceant." Can. et decr. Conc. Trid., Sess. 22, decr. de observandis et evitandis in celebr. Missae.

[2] *J. S. Bach*, i. p. 25.

that it might alter its ungodly nature, in default of which the Church would excommunicate it."

Although I have not in these lectures attempted to give any account of the music of the Mass, I have ventured, in describing the introduction of the organ, to speak with some fulness of the manner in which it was used at first in the Roman Catholic Church, as some acquaintance with this is necessary to understand the part assigned to it in the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth century, of which I now proceed to speak. By the Swiss reformers it was absolutely rejected. Zwingli was opposed not only to instrumental music but to all congregational song whatsoever. The organ in Zurich Cathedral was destroyed, and the song of the congregation silenced. Calvin regarded instrumental music as no fitter to be adopted in the public worship of the Church than the incense, the candlestick, and the shadows of the Mosaic Law. Organs and such other ludicrous things were suited to Popery, which was a ridiculous and unsuitable imitation of the Jews, whereby the word and worship of God are exceedingly profaned. Carlstadt, one of the extremists among the Lutherans, railed against Gregorian song and organs as so much empty sound fitted for theatres and princes' courts rather than divine worship. The house of God was a house "*non clamoris sed amoris.*" As there is but one God, one baptism, one faith, so the music of the Church should be one song, unison. But it was not among the extremists alone that the organ was

regarded with suspicion. Some of the most moderate reformers were opposed to it. The memory of the abuses associated with it was still fresh. To many it seemed indissolubly connected with the Popery from which the Church had been delivered. The Protestant opposition to the use in divine service of any foreign language without interpretation was conceived to rule out the organ, which spoke to the ears but not to the understanding. Among those who cherished such views about the organ we are surprised to find Luther himself. We know what an ardent lover of music he was, and how anxious he was not only to secure congregational song but to retain the figured music performed by the choir ; and it comes to us with quite a shock of surprise to find that this warm champion of ornate Church music did not regard the organ with favour. He classes it among the sensual attractions which avail nothing to the spirit, which is rather destroyed by such titillations. " There can be more faith," he says, " in a miller lad than in all the Papists, and it can avail more than all the Popes and monks with their organs and tricks, even had they more organs than there are pipes therein." In the regulations which he laid down for the Mass and divine service and in his prefaces to his hymn-books, he makes no reference to the organ.

But in spite of the coldness with which Luther regarded it and the violent opposition to it in some quarters, the organ retained its place in the Lutheran

Church. But it was not used at first to accompany the singing of the congregation which was the distinctive feature of the Lutheran worship, and this fact may in some measure explain Luther's attitude towards it. It was employed, exactly as it had been in the Roman Catholic Church, first of all to play a prelude and give the note to the minister and choir, and secondly to alternate with the choir in the rendering of those parts of the musical service assigned to them. In the singing of the hymns by the congregation the organ remained silent. They were sung by the congregation alone, or by the congregation and choir alternately. In course of time the organ was utilised to assist the congregational singing, but here again the method originally employed was not that of accompaniment but that of playing in alternation. The organ played the melody over first of all, and then struck in now and again to play a verse of the hymn while the congregation remained silent. So large a part however did the figured music in which choir and organ co-operated secure for itself in the Lutheran Church during the latter part of the sixteenth century, that there are signs of the congregational song being more and more thrust into the background. From the various admonitions addressed to organists in the Church Orders of the day we gather that various abuses, similar to those that obtained in the Roman Catholic Church, had crept into the Lutheran Church. They are admonished not to play secular organ-

pieces, and not to spin out their performance too long. A contemporary musician [1] gives the following description of the vagaries in which the organist indulged: "When the organists are required to give a specimen of their skill, their only resource is to make an empty noise without grace of art (*inanem strepitum sine ulla gratia*). To flatter the ears of their audience and to excite admiration over their technique, they run about with their fingers over the keys for half-an-hour at a time, and hope in this fashion with the help of God to move mountains by their graceful noise, but only a ridiculous mouse is brought to birth. Do not ask where Master *Mensura*, Master *Tactus*, Master *Tonus*, and especially Master *Bona Fantasia* are to be found. For after they have wandered about for some time with the greatest quickness over the keys playing in unison, they begin at last a two-part fugue, and working away with both feet on the pedals, they add the remaining parts. But such music in the ears not only of an expert, but even of any man of common sense and sound judgment, is as agreeable as the braying of an ass."

As we have seen, the organ during the sixteenth century did not, in the Lutheran Church, accompany the congregational singing of the chorales. It maintained a position of independence, and when it co-

[1] Hermann Finck, quoted Rietschel, *Die Aufgabe der Orgel im Gottesdienste*, p. 681 f.

operated in the rendering of the chorale, it was by striking in occasionally in alternation with the singing of the congregation. It was during the seventeenth century that it came to be used to support the singing of the congregation. There were two different methods in which it was employed for this purpose. The first was the one which appears to us the most natural, the one with which we are familiar in our present-day employment of the organ for this purpose, viz., that the organ supplied the harmonic foundation for the support of the melody which was sung by the congregation. Originally the melody was in the tenor, whence the origin of the name. It was Osiander, the Würtemberg Court preacher, who first conceived the idea of putting the melody in the upper part; and in the year 1586 he published a collection of fifty sacred songs and psalms "set contrapuntally," as the title says, "in four parts in such a way that the whole Christian congregation can always join in them." In his arrangement he had no thought of the organ co-operating in the performance. The counterpoint which he supplied was designed for the choir, not for the organ. But the transference of the melody to the upper part was a great advance; and when the co-operation of the organ with the congregation was contemplated, it seemed natural to modify as much as possible the polyphonic movement of the lower parts, and to assign to the organ a harmonic rather than a figurate form of accompaniment. That was one method in

which the organ was employed to support the congregational singing. But there was another and more complicated method employed, which could not, we should think, have served the purpose so well, but which was destined to prove fruitful in inspiration for the development of organ music. When Osiander transferred the melody to the treble, he retained a certain amount of polyphonic movement in the lower parts. He was followed by a number of composers, such as Eccard and Prætorius, who developed the polyphony indulged in by the choir to richer fulness, and converted the chorale into a kind of motet in which the choir wove a texture of florid counterpoint round the *canto fermo* sung by the congregation. When the idea was conceived of utilising the organ for the accompaniment of the congregation, the second method employed was to hand over to the instrument both the chorale melody sung by the congregation and the elaborate counterpoint supplied by the choir. The melody could be made to stand out boldly by the use of louder stops, while the florid counterpoint which, when rendered by the choir, might be apt to confuse the congregation by its prominence, could be kept subordinate by the employment of softer ones. Whether this method of treatment was likely to prove helpful as an encouragement to congregational singing is open to doubt. But it is of great interest because it was the germ—nay, we may say rather the bud almost on the point of bursting—

from which was to emerge one of the fairest flowers of organ music, the Chorale Prelude, which the genius of Bach was to develop to such perfection.

Before we leave Germany, let us glance for a moment or two at the manner in which the organ was actually employed in supporting the congregational singing, once its serviceability for this purpose was recognised. In consequence of the slow rate at which the chorales were sung, there was much fuller opportunity for introducing florid counterpoint into the accompaniment than in the case of an English hymn. The singing was preluded by improvisation on the theme of the chorale melody, and between each verse further improvisation was introduced; nay, not only between each verse, but even between each line there was an instrumental interlude. The effect must have been as disastrous to the coherence of the chorale as the practice of "lining out" in the psalm-singing in England. Evidently such methods of accompanying the congregational singing gave full opportunity to the organist to employ the resources of his art, and there was great temptation to sacrifice the interests of the congregation to the display of one's skill as an executant. A writer in the middle of the eighteenth century complains that several organists introduce as many variations when the congregation are singing as if they were playing a chorale prelude. "Now are heard two-part variations and diminutions, now the bass, now the upper part sports about;

they kick with the feet, they ornament the tune, they break it up and hack it about till one does not know what it is. Is this the right way to keep a congregation together? I should say rather, to confuse it." [1] Even John Sebastian Bach was guilty of such extravagances in his youthful days; and there is an interesting record in the archives of the Principality of Sonderhausen in which the Consistory take him to task, among other things, for the manner in which he played the service, now preludising at inordinate length before the singing of the chorales, and then, when objection was taken to this, going to the other extreme and reducing the prelude to a minimum, now introducing surprising variations or strange harmonies into the chorales so as to confuse the congregation. One can understand how a youthful genius like Bach must have revelled in the opportunity presented by such a method of accompanying the chorales as I have described, and frequently overstepped the limits suggested by reasonable consideration for the congregation. But all the same one cannot but feel that the Consistory was in the right in protesting against the liberties he took in his accompaniment of the chorales as likely to confuse the congregation, and in urging him in future to restrain the exuberance of his genius.

[1] Adlung, *Anleitung zur musikalischen Gelahrtheit*, p. 681 f.

In England the use of the organ in Church worship was carried over with the rest of the musical service from the Roman Catholic to the Reformed Church. The outstanding names in the Cathedral music of the Tudor period—Byrd, Tallis, Merbecke, Tye—were all organists. It was from the Puritan side that the opposition to instrumental music came. The Puritans were opposed to the whole Cathedral Service with its "organs, singing, ringing and trowling of Psalms from one side of the church to another, with the squeaking of chanting choristers, disguised in white surplices." [1] Instrumental music they condemned as both Jewish and Popish. The artistic side of worship made no appeal to them. Sir Edward Deering declared that one single groan in the spirit was worth the Diapason of all the Church music in the world.[2] When the Great Rebellion came and the Puritan cause gained the victory, the opposition to instrumental music took practical form, and organs were ruthlessly destroyed all over the country. Cromwell himself was a lover of music,

[1] A request of all true Christians to the House of Parliament, 1586.

[2] The sentiment was echoed in later times by C. H. Spurgeon: "That the Great Lord cares to be praised by bellows we very gravely question; we cannot see any connection between the glory of God and sounds produced by machinery. One broken note from a grateful heart must have more real acceptable praise in it than all the wind which swept through whistling pipes."

and it is not fair to blame him for the destruction. But the fanatical frenzy of his soldiery knew no bounds, and they took a savage delight in desecrating and destroying all the paraphernalia of the hated Episcopal form of worship. Organs were either removed or broken up, choirs disbanded and their books destroyed, stained glass windows broken, the whole Choral Service abolished, and there was even a proposal to pull down the whole of the cathedrals.

With the Restoration the old order of worship again came into being, and efforts were made to have the Cathedral Service restored. But one difficulty was the lack of organs. The organ-builders' occupation was gone during the interregnum, and when the demand arose for instruments to replace those that had been destroyed, there were hardly any builders in the country to execute the work. Help had to be sought abroad, and some of the chief organs of the Restoration period were built by two men who came from the Continent, a German, Bernhardt Schmidt (generally known as Father Smith, to distinguish him from his two nephews who accompanied him), and Rènè or Renatus Harris, the son of an English organ-builder who had emigrated to France. Smith built the organs for Whitehall, Christ Church, Oxford, Westminster Abbey, and St. Paul's ; and Harris those of Salisbury, Ely, and Bristol. There is an interesting story of a competition between Smith and Harris for the supply of the organ for the Temple Church.

Each was required to set up an organ in one of the halls of the Temple, in order that the Benchers might choose between them. This was accordingly done, and after a protracted delay and the excitement of a good deal of feeling on the part of the supporters of the respective competitors, the decision was ultimately given in favour of Father Smith. It is interesting to note that the players selected by Father Smith to display the powers of his instrument were Dr. Blow and Henry Purcell, who had been Blow's pupil. In due time the difficulties caused by the scarcity of organ-builders righted themselves. The great demand for instruments all over the country called forth a supply of builders able to carry out the work, and the organ became firmly established in its place in divine worship.

In the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland the introduction of instrumental music was a matter of much later date than in the Reformed Churches in Germany and England. In its beginnings the Reformed Church in Scotland was in close alliance with the Church at Geneva, and the position which Calvin took up on Church worship exercised a dominating influence upon the worship of the Church of Scotland during a long period of its history. As is well known, Calvin would admit nothing into the praise of the sanctuary but the Psalms of David. He banned all musical instruments, holding that their use in the Old Testament was indissolubly associated with the Jewish legislation, and that if

we were to admit them into the worship of the Church, we should likewise have to admit the incense, the candlestick, and the shadows of the Jewish law. "We know," he says,[1] "that our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared, and by His own advent abolished these legal shadows. That instrumental music, therefore, we hold to have been tolerated by reason of that time and people, because, as Holy Scripture says, they were as boys who needed such boyish rudiments, which must not at this time of day be recalled, unless we wish to overthrow the perfection of the Gospel, and to obscure the full light to which we have attained in Christ our Lord." The praise restricted to the Psalms, and these in metrical form suited for congregational singing without any instrumental assistance—these were the narrow limits within which the music of the Scottish Church was confined for more than a couple of centuries.

As can well be imagined the reactionary movement in England was viewed with much favour by the Scottish Church. When the Commissioners of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the Westminster Assembly wrote in 1644 to the General Assembly giving an account of their labours, among the great things already done in which they admired the good hand of God mention was made of the taking down of "the great organs at Paul's and Peter's at Westminster," which the General Assembly

[1] 1 Sam. xviii.

specially mentioned in their reply among the things which they were greatly refreshed to hear.

It was not till the beginning of the nineteenth century that we hear of any proposal to introduce instrumental music into the Scottish Church. The first attempt seems to have been made in 1807 in St. Andrew's Church, Glasgow, which had an organ that was made by the famous inventor, James Watt. This was used to assist at the weekly congregational practice of praise, and on one occasion it was employed in divine service on Sunday to accompany the concluding Psalm. The matter was brought before the Presbytery, who gave it as their opinion "that the use of organs in the public worship of God is contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constitution of our Established Church;" and therefore prohibited it in all the churches and chapels within their bounds. As the St. Andrew's experiment was confined to the use of the organ for a single Psalm on one occasion only, it may be regarded as the thin end of the wedge in the most literal sense of the term. Not for another half century was any attempt made to press the matter further. It was in Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh, that the next step was taken, the minister, Dr. Robert Lee, here introducing the reading of prayers and the use of a harmonium to accompany the congregational singing. The matter came before the General Assembly of 1864, which decided that such practices were not contrary to the law of the Church, and were

to be forbidden only when they tended to create dispeace in the congregation. The legality of the practice having been established, it gradually spread until in course of time it became the general practice throughout the Church of Scotland. In 1872 the United Presbyterian Synod, after many refusals, decided to permit the use of instrumental music. In the Free Church the innovation was more bitterly contested, and it was only after a severe conflict that the champions of instrumental music ultimately gained the victory. Now throughout the United Free Church, i.e., the Church formed by the union of the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches, the organ is in general use, while in the Free Church of the present day, i.e., the remnant of the former Free Church which refused to enter into the United Free Church, it is still denied a place.

It is interesting to recall some of the arguments used on either side in this acute controversy. One's dominant feeling when reading them is of how completely our position has changed from that taken up by the disputants. We regard the matter from the utilitarian point of view. The question of admitting instrumental music into Church worship is to be determined by its serviceability. Is it an aid to worship? Does it deepen our devotion and make our song of praise more hearty? But in the discussions of these days the question is argued almost entirely along Scriptural lines. Is there, or is there not Scriptural authority for it? It is

not enough that it be proved that instrumental worship is not prohibited in Scripture. "We must find an express warrant in God's Word," says Dr. Begg,[1] "for all that we do in the worship of God." "There is no middle ground," says Professor Girardeau,[2] "between submission to God's revealed will and a worship dictated by the fancies of sinners." At first blush one might fancy that the free use of instruments in the Old Testament would seem to authorise their employment in Church worship. But to this the opponents of instruments reply that we are not under the Old Testament dispensation, but under the new. It is true that God approved of instrumental music in the temple worship. But this was no immutable decree to remain for ever in force, but a positive enactment which might be changed at His pleasure. If we are to hold by the divine approval of instrumental music in Old Testament worship, then we must likewise retain the other things with which it is inseparably associated, circumcision, the passover, sacrifice, and the like. Dr. Candlish, one of the most stalwart disputants, argues, exactly in the spirit of Calvin, "that if the organ be admitted, there is no barrier in principle against the sacerdotal system in all its fulness—against the substitution again, in our whole religion, of the formal for the spiritual, the symbolic

[1] *Instrumental Music*, p. 2.
[2] *Music in the Church*, p. 180.

for the real." This was the position on the one side. The supporters of instrumental music sought to rebut these arguments by proving that the instrumental music introduced under the Old Testament dispensation was not essentially connected with the sacerdotal features of the temple worship. The arguments were sometimes more ingenious than convincing. The silver trumpets mentioned in Numbers x., though occasionally used in connexion with sacrifice, were really quite distinct from it. They were used for other purposes as well, and were, to quote the words of one of the writers of the time,[1] " simply an exhibition of Christ, the prophet, uttering His will as the sovereign ruler of the Hebrew church-state." " The institution of trumpets resembled nothing in the present dispensation but the ordinance of preaching." [2] Similarly it is argued that the service of praise introduced into the temple worship was not essentially or in principle connected with sacrifice and the priesthood. It was the free-will offering of the people, and was not under the control of the priests as it would have been had it been essentially connected with sacrifice. It being thus proved that the Old Testament sacerdotal system and the Hebrew service of praise were quite distinct, it follows that they do not stand or fall together, and supporters of the use of instrumental music in worship may survey unmoved the conten-

[1] Cromar, *Vindication of the Organ*, p. 55.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

tion that if they admit the organ they are in consistency bound to accept the sacerdotal system in its fulness.

That is a specimen of the lines of argument adopted by the disputants on either side. They were agreed on their premiss of the necessity of the sanction of Scripture, and upon this common ground they fought the battle with grim determination. And meanwhile the issue was being decided in a different corner of the field. The post which either side was fighting for, under the impression that its possession would secure the victory, had become of no strategic importance. The principle upon which the use of instrumental music in Church was ultimately to be determined really lay much deeper. It was whether or not the use of instrumental music satisfied a genuine craving of human nature, whether it helped or hindered the worship of that God who is Spirit and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. If the use of the organ could justify itself on that ground, then the victory was assured. It was not by the superiority of their arguments in the Scriptural discussion that the champions of instrumental music gained the day, but by the pragmatistic test of its value as an aid to devotion.

Let us turn now to consider the place which the organ holds in our present-day services, and the manner in which it may be used to best advantage. Its function is twofold, first to accompany the congregation and the choir, and secondly to provide certain

independent musical numbers, called voluntaries, at different points of the service.

First then of the organ as an accompanying instrument, and specially of its use in accompanying the singing of the congregation. This is its chief function, the ground upon which its admission into our churches at the present day is usually defended. One writer, indeed, would assign to it a more menial office, restricting its use in worship to the prelude at the assembling of the congregation and the postlude at their dismissal, in order to cover the noise made by the people when coming in and going out.[1] But as he is an avowed opponent of instrumental music, his proposal is not to be taken seriously. That the organ can be of the greatest assistance in the support and encouragement of congregational singing will readily be admitted by all who realise the possibilities of the instrument when properly used for this purpose. But it does not follow that in the hands of an unskilful performer it will have this result, and there are doubtless many instances, to which the opponents of instrumental music might point, where the introduction of the organ has tended to diminish rather than to swell the volume of praise that rises from the lips of the congregation. That being so, it behoves all organists to give careful heed to the manner in which they discharge this, the most important of the duties of their office. Just as the arrangements for the singing of the choir in the

[1] Harms, *Past. Theol.*, ii. 79.

Psalms and hymns must all be made with a view to the participation of the congregation, so the organist must always keep their interests before him in his organ accompaniment. He has to play in such a manner as shall give them encouragement and support, to diffuse around them an atmosphere of sound which shall remove the feeling of isolation which makes them afraid to lift up their voice, and yet at the same time to beware lest he drown their voices under the dominating tones of the instrument. As he has to keep the *via media* in respect of quantity of tone, so likewise in respect of *tempo*. The tendency of the congregation is to drag, and the organist has to see to it that he does not so accommodate his pace to them as to get slower and slower as the song proceeds. But in his desire to avoid this error, he may fall into the opposite one of so accelerating the pace that he leaves the congregation quite behind. This is a mistake of which many organists are guilty. They seem to identify slow with dragging singing, and to fancy that the only way to avoid dragging is to quicken the pace. But apart from the fact that such a quick tempo is utterly at variance with the character of most congregational tunes, it does not remedy the evil. The congregation still drag in a breathless kind of fashion in their effort to overtake the organ which is running away from them.[1] The

[1] "It is when he (the organist) is constantly trying to force the pace that dragging always ensues" (S. H. Nicholson, *A Manual of English Church Music*, p. 143).

remedy for dragging is not so much a matter of pace as of securing an understanding between organ and congregation, giving them encouragement, gently urging them to alertness, making them feel that the praise in which they are taking part is their affair and that its success depends on their co-operation. It is difficult to put into words the kind of "way with him" that an organist has who carries the congregation along with him. It is not altogether a matter of pace or of volume of tone, though both of these enter into it. It is in a minor degree the kind of relationship which a good conductor soon establishes with a choir which, when it comes into his hands, is stiff, stolid, and intractable, but which by the force of his personality he soon reduces to pliability. I say in a minor degree, for the organist cannot hope to make the congregation so quickly responsive as a conductor can a choir; but it is the same kind of relationship that he has to establish with them. I believe that what often frustrates the establishment of such relations between organist and congregation is the presence of the choir. Having them at his hand quick to respond, he is apt to forget the congregation beyond, which is much more sluggish in movement and requires to be more coaxingly dealt with. If our organists could in their accompaniment of the congregational singing forget altogether the existence of the choir and play as they would if it were a matter between the congregation and themselves, I believe our Church singing would be better than it is.

In the accompaniment of the hymns and other material of congregational praise, the organist does not, of course, confine himself to the music as it is written, but uses that as the foundation upon which to build a superstructure which shall give fuller scope to the resources of the instrument. There are manifold ways in which he can infuse new life and colour into the music before him. One of the dangers attending congregational singing, which is constrained to aim at a full volume of tone rather than delicacy of expression, is monotony; and it should be the aim of the organist to seek to secure variety. There are several methods by which he may effect this. There is first of all the great wealth of tone-colour at his disposal through the variety of stops of the instrument. By skilful registering he can invest every verse of the hymn with fresh interest. "Though the sacrifice is the same," to use Thomas Fuller's phrase, "yet the dressing of it is different." As a general rule anything in the way of descriptive accompaniment is to be avoided. To attempt a realistic reproduction of the roar of the thunder, the sighing of the winds, the singing of the birds, and the chimes of bells, goes beyond the limits of legitimate musical art, and offends by its cheapness and vulgarity. The words which Beethoven wrote at the top of his Pastoral Symphony: "Expression of feeling rather than description," indicate what is the true province of music, though he may not himself have consistently

adhered to the principle throughout the work. And if the organist is anxious, as he very properly should be, to give expression to the sentiments of the text, he should do so not by attempting to reproduce the actual physical sounds referred to, but by endeavouring to stimulate the feelings which those sounds evoke. Then further there are countless variations available by certain ornamentations which he may introduce. While still keeping to the harmony before him, he may manipulate the chords in a variety of ways by arpeggios, broken chords, sustained notes, or movement in the various parts, or he may weave a descant which makes the original melody stand out with added charm. Then if the congregation is singing in unison, he may vary the harmony, which in itself makes an enormous difference in the way of relieving monotony. Care must be taken in this connexion that the liberties one allows oneself in the way of modulation do not degenerate into licence. There is a story of Beethoven in his youth having once quite put out a singer in the Hof-Kirche at Bonn by the boldness of his modulations. And the Consistory made it a complaint against Bach that he was not content with introducing a *tonus Peregrinus*, but sometimes wandered off into a *tonum contrarium*, which seems to have been some extreme modulation. A change of harmony makes a wonderful difference in the character of a familiar melody. That is why a varied harmony is so effective as a relief to monotony. But if the new harmony

be startling and remote, the effect is apt to be unsettling, and the novelty which kept within bounds would be an added attraction, is only too likely to prove disastrous to the singing of the congregation. One can recall settings of familiar songs by some of our modern composers which are so indefinite in their tonality that it is only by a kind of *tour de force* that the singer can hold his own against the accompaniment. Anything of that kind in the way of varied harmony to a hymn tune is to be deprecated. In all the different methods at his disposal for the introduction of variety, the organist must never forget that it is the singing of the congregation that is the matter of first importance, that his part is merely to accompany, and that whenever by his accompaniment he disturbs the congregation or inspires any feeling of insecurity, he has failed in the discharge of his function.

The accompaniment of plainsong and Gregorian Chant is a special branch of the organist's art upon which I do not propose to speak at any length. Strictly speaking, this style of singing should be unaccompanied, and if the organ is introduced it must be kept in complete subordination to the voices. As we have seen, the outstanding characteristics of this style of music are its free rhythm and its modal tonality; and on no account must either of these be interfered with. Any attempt to make its free rhythm fit into the Procrustean bed of our measured music is to be deprecated. It loses all its charm

when its freedom of movement is reduced to a steady march. Similarly the modal tonality must be preserved in the accompaniment. The organist must realise that the great wealth of harmonic material at his disposal in modern tunes is now reduced to a minimum. As Dr. Madeley Richardson says:[1] "To dress up ancient tones with diminished sevenths and all the devices of modern music, is a thing to be abhorred; far better leave them alone altogether. The player should transfer himself in spirit to the old days; he should forget that he has ever heard modern music, and play what he would have played had he lived before it was invented; so will he make the modal music a thing of beauty, and worthy its place as worship music."

In accompanying the choir when singing alone, the treatment of the organ will vary considerably from that employed for congregational singing. There the organist recognises that there are certain musical blemishes incident to the situation which it behoves him so far as possible to make good. The strains of the instrument envelop the singing of the congregation in a mantle of sound which, like charity, covers a multitude of sins. What is lacking in precision of attack, intelligence of phrasing, and, within certain limits, delicacy of expression, the organist endeavours to make good by his use of the instrument. But with the choir it is quite different.

[1] *Modern Organ Accompaniment*, p. 146.

That is precisely the way in which a choir should *not* be accompanied; yet it is, unfortunately, the method which prevails in a great number of our churches. The choir must learn not to depend upon the organ. The reason why so many choirs fail in this respect is, I believe, because of the constant use of the instrument at rehearsal. When required to sing without accompaniment, they feel as if some inordinate demand were being made upon them; whereas the plain fact of the matter is that a choir that cannot sing without accompaniment cannot sing at all. Many anthems have no independent accompaniment, and are best rendered unaccompanied. When the organ is used to accompany them, let it be distinctly understood that its position is subordinate. It is there not to lead but to support the choir. Far too often the result of the method of rehearsal to which I have referred is that instead of the organ accompanying the choir, it is the choir that accompany the organ, the instrument always leading off in the attack and giving exaggerated emphasis to all marks of expression, while the choir plod along, with little attempt at variation of expression, as a sort of undertone to the more brilliant performance of the organ. Where there is an independent organ part, the organist has more opportunity for boldness of treatment. Here the choir must stand by itself. It has its own part to sing, and the organ part stands in contrast to it, and is equally important, or almost so. It is a mistake in

such a case to keep the organ subdued. It has a claim of its own to be heard, and full scope is to be given to the resources of the instrument in the way of tone-colour, dynamic effect, and variety of expression, due care, of course, being always exercised that the choir is not overweighted.

In addition to accompanying the congregation and choir, the organ is used from time to time as a solo instrument in the course of the service. In a great many churches it plays over the tune of the hymn or Psalm before the congregation. Dr. Madeley Richardson objects to this practice as neither necessary, sensible, nor seemly. "It is not necessary," he says,[1] "if the singers know the tune; if they do not, it is too late to begin learning it a moment before it is to be sung. . . . It is unreasonable, for the notes played do not constitute an organ piece; they are vocal parts, and should be treated as such. . . . It is unseemly, for it suggests the idea of a rehearsal rather than a set service." There is force in these objections. But all the same if new tunes are to be introduced, we can hardly assume that the congregation do not require such assistance. The choir will have practised them beforehand, but they are quite unfamiliar to the congregation, and the playing over will prove a help. And there is the further ground upon which the playing over of the tunes may be defended, viz., to set the rate at

[1] *Modern Organ Accompaniment*, p. 69.

which the Psalm or hymn to be sung is to be taken. Possibly other considerations weigh in the retention of the practice. If the tune be not played over, then in order to avoid too abrupt a commencement a short instrumental prelude on the melody about to be sung might be introduced. This requires a certain gift of extemporisation on the part of the organist. In the hands of a brilliant musician the little prelude before the hymn might become a thing of beauty to which it would be a delight to listen. In the hands of the average organist who can make no pretension to creative imagination, it is apt to degenerate into a meaningless succession of chords, or an incoherent jumble of fragments of the melody. As the proportion of musical geniuses to unpretentious performers among our organists is naturally small, this may explain the retention of the custom of playing over, even when it is admitted that under ideal conditions it might advantageously give place to the artistic prelude. Better to—

> bear those ills we have
> Than fly to others that we know not of.

But the chief opportunity for the organ in the way of independent contribution to the service is in the voluntaries at the commencement and conclusion of the service, and in many churches during the taking of the collection. These voluntaries may be either free improvisations or renderings of some organ pieces. Where the organist has the gift necessary

to the former method, he has the advantage of being able to adapt his voluntaries to the spirit of the occasion, and make them echo and enforce the lessons of the service. But it is, as I have said, a gift to which few can aspire. There is a story of Bach improvising for half an hour on end on "An Wasserflüthen Babylon," and being complimented by the old Hamburg master Reinken, who said: "I thought this art had perished, but I see that it still lives on in you." But Bachs are rare, and there are comparatively few organists who have the gifts which justify their attempting to improvise voluntaries. Anything more dreary than the aimless meandering about from chord to chord or phrase to phrase, without form or purpose, which is the usual result of the efforts of the man who lacks the inspiration of genius, can hardly be imagined. "Is anything more exasperating," asks M. Widor,[1] "than an improvisation in four parts, wandering now here, now there—monotonous in colour, devoid of determination, repose, contrast, or purpose, having neither beginning, middle, nor end? A veritable *macaroni au fromage!*" Those who are conscious that they do not possess the genius to make improvisation a work of art, would do well to confine themselves to the performance of some definite piece of music.

[1] Preface to Pirro's *Johann Sebastian Bach, The Organist*, p. xviii.

But what is the kind of music best fitted for the purpose? That is a question which every organist who takes a serious view of his office will carefully ponder. It will inevitably lead on to the further question: What is the purpose of the voluntary? What place does it occupy in divine service? And any attempt seriously to answer that question will at once dismiss as utterly unworthy many voluntaries which find a place in our Church services, and as entirely irrelevant the grounds upon which their introduction is defended. The function of the voluntaries at the beginning and end of the service is not to cover the noise made by the congregation when taking or leaving their places in church. It is not to tickle the ears of the hearers by giving them something that they like. It has a definite religious object. These voluntaries are meant to quicken the sense of reverence with which we take our place and prepare ourselves for worship in the House of God, to deepen the impression made by the service in which we have been taking part and the lessons which the preacher has been enforcing. Once we realise this, a great deal of the music which at present does duty as organ voluntary is forthwith put out of court. The sickly sentimental melody, "loathsome in its own deliciousness," the light tripping dance measure, the showy concert piece in which the organist can "exploit the resources of the instrument," the noisy march with which the congregation are played out—these and such-like productions we

at once set aside as quite unworthy. Then further, it is not enough that music be good to justify its use as a voluntary. It may be of most excellent quality, and yet by its inherent character or its secular associations prove unfit for use in divine worship. It is a difficult matter to say what makes us regard one kind of music as sacred and another as not, when it is purely instrumental without any text associated with it. Undoubtedly association has a great deal to do with it.[1] A certain style of music has grown up within the Church. At the time when music was coming to a consciousness of its powers and developing them to riper fulness, this was the form in which, in the service of the Church, these powers found expression. Religion has put its stamp indelibly upon it, and in virtue of this association it seems peculiarly fitted to awaken religious feelings in the breast. In the field of organ music the leading exponent of the type of music I have been referring to is John Sebastian Bach. In his works our organists have not only a comprehensive repertory of music of the very highest quality upon which to draw, but likewise an excellent school in which to

[1] " There is no sacredness, says Ruskin, in round arches or in pointed, in pinnacles or in buttresses ; and we may say with equal pertinence that there is nothing sacred *per se* in sixteenth-century counterpoint, Lutheran choral, or Calvinist psalm-tune " (Dickinson, *Music in the History of the Western Church*, p. 271.

cultivate a taste for what is sound and devotional in organ music. Among Bach's organ works the Chorale Preludes stand out as eminently suited for divine worship. The *Little Organ Book,* which contains forty-six Chorale Preludes, mostly comparatively short, should prove a rich storehouse for the Church organist. Here is a collection of organ pieces suffused with the poetical fire and religious devotion of one of the greatest personalities in the field of religious music. In addition to the collection just referred to Bach has written other Chorale Preludes or Fantasias on a more elaborate scale. And yet till comparatively recently these works were little known in this country. Bach's other organ works, at least the more outstanding of them, were familiar to all who made any pretence to competence on the instrument; but the Chorale Preludes were a *terra incognita* to all but a comparatively few enthusiasts. Thanks to the labours of such men as Spitta, Schweitzer, Pirro, Parry, and Harvey Grace, the attention of organists has been drawn to the richness of the treasure, of the highest value for liturgical purposes, contained in these wonderful compositions; and it is devoutly to be hoped that they may bulk more largely in our Church services than they have done in the past. And they have likewise served, one is glad to note, as models to composers of more recent years for a class of voluntary eminently suited for use in Church worship. "Our organ music for purely Church use,"

says Harvey Grace,[1] " has benefited lately from two sources, one old and one new; Bach, whose Chorale Preludes are now familiar to a good many organists and congregations, and Karg-Elert, whose recent output of nearly a hundred pieces founded on chorales has revived interest in a form that some historians had regarded as obsolete. The result of this awakened interest has been a substantial and steadily growing store of English organ music written round our native hymns, by such composers as Parry, Stanford, Charles Wood, Charlton Palmer, C. W. Pearce, Harold Darke, C. H. Kitson, E. C. Bairstow, John E. West, Bristow Farrar, Vaughan Williams, and others. The bulk of this music is founded on the standard tunes which are, or should be, in regular use in our churches, and the style ranges from simple accompanied melody to elaborate development. In no case do we find the now discredited set variation form, with its inane twitterings." In addition, if something of a more vigorous nature be desired for the final voluntary, there are the preludes and fugues of the great master, whose infinite variety 'age cannot wither nor custom stale.' Some, it must be admitted, are of a brilliancy that makes them more suited for use at recitals than in divine worship. Yet even so they are infinitely preferable to the noisy compositions

[1] Article on " Organ Voluntaries," in *A Manual of English Church Music*, p. 162 f.

that are often made to do duty as concluding voluntaries. "We must always keep in mind," says Professor Dickinson,[1] "that the question of appropriateness in church music depends very much upon association. A style that would be execrated as blasphemous in a Calvinist assembly would be received as perfectly becoming in a Catholic or Lutheran ceremony. . . . It may be said that Bach's grandest organ pieces are conceived as the expression of what may be called the religious passion—the rapture which may not unworthily come upon the believer when his soul opens to the reception of ideas the most penetrating and sublime." I would again recall Mendelssohn's saying that Bach could turn any concert room in which his works were performed into a church. Even in his most brilliant organ pieces we can never divest ourselves of the idea that they were composed for an instrument whose true place is the church, and by a man who felt constrained to lay the most exquisite productions of his genius as offerings upon the divine altar.

While pleading that our organists should make their voluntaries worthy to be reckoned as an integral part of the service, it is only right that I should point out that a certain responsibility rests upon our congregations. The organist is often pestered by their importunity to have their ears

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 299.

tickled by some tawdry flummery decked out by the employment of fancy stops. Too often they regard the voluntary as a kind of show-piece to be performed for their delectation. There is great temptation to a man who has not a high sense of the dignity of his office to gratify their predilections, and to prostitute his talents in order to win a little cheap applause. And there is another respect in which, it seems to me, our congregations, and our ministers too, will require to adopt a change of attitude if the concluding voluntary is to attain the high level which appears becoming. We urge our organists to regard the voluntaries as an integral part of the service. But is it really so if minister and congregation leave their places during its performance? The proper course would seem to be for both to remain where they are till the voluntary is concluded. When the Dead March is played on any occasion of mourning, no one thinks of leaving the church till its conclusion. Why? Because it is felt that it is a part of the service. But is not that what we should feel with regard to the concluding voluntary in every case? It may appear a counsel of perfection, and certainly it will probably be long before it becomes established practice, but it seems to me that one of the most helpful ways to secure the elevation of the concluding voluntary to the high artistic and liturgical level that appears becoming would be the adoption by minister and congregation of the attitude which I have suggested.

I would close by a strong plea to our organists to recognise the sacredness of their calling, and to magnify their office by the spirit in which they devote themselves to the discharge of its duties. One is glad to notice in recent years an enormous improvement in this respect on the part of the musicians who give their services to the Church. Our Societies of Organists are giving ever-increasing evidence of their realisation of the sacred character of their office, and their sincere desire to make their contribution to the music of the Church a veritable aid to worship. In no department of Church music is the manifestation of such a spirit more necessary than in the voluntaries, where the organist can do so much to make or mar the spirit of reverence which becomes the worship of the sanctuary. What Sir John Goss is reported to have said of a well-known organist of his day, George Cooper, well expresses the spirit in which the organist should address himself to his work: "He always places the worship of God first, then the composer's views or intentions, his choir next, then his organ, and himself last." To make the enumeration complete, one would have liked to see the congregation included; but so far as the first and last places are concerned, there can be no question as to the correctness of the order. Only when he puts the glory of God in the foremost place and his own interest last can the organist, or indeed anyone who makes any contribution to the worship of the sanctuary, worthily discharge his office.

The instrument over which our organists have command has been well named the King of Instruments. But *corruptio optimi pessima,* and just because it is the king of instruments, if it be prostituted to unworthy uses, it may become a most potent agent for evil in the music of the Church. Let them never fail to put the worship of God in the foremost place and to use the great powers which the instrument puts at their disposal for His glory, and we need have no fear but that, in spite of the misgiving with which in many quarters its introduction into Church worship was hailed, it will prove a most powerful influence for deepening the spirit of devotion with which the congregation lift their hearts in worship to Almighty God.

INDEX.

AELRED, 224.
Alleluia, 97, 138.
Ambrose, 96, 98, 135.
Amiel, 31.
Anglican Chant, 36, 99 f., 188.
Anthem, 55, 69, 202 ff.
— Verse, 203 f.
Antiphon, 96.
Antiphonal chant, 91, 96, 105, 131, 188.
Aquinas, 140, 224.
Aristotle, 18, 34.
Arnold, Matthew, 40.
Associative power of music, 41 ff., 74 f., 258.
Athanasius, 83.
Augustine, 97, 135.
Authentic modes, 98.

BACH, J. S., 25, 60, 63, 195 f., 236, 256.
Baillie, Robt., 114.
Beethoven, 21, 39, 48, 250.
Berlioz, 7.
Bingham, 171.
Boyd, Zachary, 161.
Boyé, 25.
Bohemian Brethren, 146.
Bottomley, 16.
Browne, Sir Thos., 17, 32.
Browning, 15, 22 f., 33.
Burnet, Bishop, 107.
Burney, 70.
Burton, 5.
Butcher, 14.

Cæremoniale, 227.
Calvin, 107, 229, 239 f.
Candlish, 243.
Cantata, Church, 190-8.
Canticles, 131, 201, 209.
Carlstadt, 229.
Carlyle, 30.
Cathedral service, 198-208.
Chant, Anglican, 36, 99 f., 188.
— Gregorian, 36, 97 ff., 188.
Chanting of Psalms, 104, 186 ff.
Choir, 171-212.
— function of, 177 ff.
— music reserved for, 69, 186, 189, 210 f.
Chorale, 149 ff., 153, 197.
— Preludes, 259 f.
Chrysostom, 94, 96, 104.
Cicero, 41.
Clarke, Jeremiah, 164.
Clement of Alexandria, 215 ff.
Common tunes, 116, 119.
Conclusions, 113, 115.
Congregational singing, 69 f., 177 ff., 209.
Congruity of music with sentiment, 63 ff.
Cranmer, 121.
Croft, 164.
Cromar, 244.
Curwen, 177.

DÆMONIC element in music, 30.
Damon's Psalter, 111.
Dancing, 34 ff.
Darwin, 13.
Davies, Walford, 2, 5.
Day, 110.
Dearmer, 48, 72.
Descant, 185.
Devotion, music to deepen, 60, 63.

Dickens, 8, 57, 165.
Dickinson, 258, 261.
Druitt, 102.
Duhm, 86.
Duncan-Jones, 101.

Emerson, 8, 17, 27.
Emotional appeal of music, 53 f.
Emotionalism, 59.
Ephraim the Syrian, 133.
Ethical significance of music, 58.
Eusebius, 93, 97, 215.

Faux-Bourdon, 185.
Feeling, music as expressive of, 20 f., 63.
Feelings, appeal of music to the, 4 ff., 53.
Florid tunes, 125 f., 165 f.
Frere, 111.

Gabrieli, 192.
Genevan Psalter, 112.
Gerhardt, 151.
Gevaert, 74.
Gibbons, 157.
Girardeau, 243.
Gluck, 25.
God-experience and music, 33.
Goethe, 7, 30.
Grace, Harvey, 260.
Gregorian Chant, 36, 97 ff., 188.
Gurney, 8.

Hadow, 58.
Hanslick, 4, 21.
Harmony, 91, 144.
Harris, Rèné, 238.
Hately, 126.
Hauptmann, 28.
Heber, 160.
Helvetius, 26.
Hilary, 134.
Hooker, 77, 103.
Humphrey, Pelham, 206.
Hydraulic organ, 218.
Hymnody, Eastern, 132-4.
— English, 154-61.
— German, 144-54.
— Latin, 134-44.
Hymns, early Christian, 131 ff.
Hymn tunes, English, 164 ff.

Ignatius, 96.
Improvisation, 255 f.
Indefiniteness of music, 25 f.
Instrumental music, 213 ff., 219.

Jebb, 186, 199, 203, 206.
Jerome, 95, 215.
Jubilus, 97.
Julian, 219.

Keble, 161
Keller, Helen, 9 f.
Knox, John, 112.

Laodicea, Council of, 133.
Laud, 122, 202.
Lee, Dr. Robt., 241.
Lee, Vernon, 10.
Livingston, Neil, 116.
Lucian, 34.
Lucretius, 17.
Luther, 75, 83, 107, 147 ff., 172 f., 226, 230.

Marot, 106.
Mass, music of the, 190.
Melody, 73.
Mendelssohn, 24, 54, 60, 105, 189.
Merbecke, 201.
Minnesinger, 144.
Modes, 41, 62 ff., 97 f., 110, 116 f.
Monteverde, 192.
Mudge, 33.
Mysterious character of music, 30 f.

Napoleon, 5.
Neale, 134.
Neumeister, 194.
Notker, 138.
Numinous, the, 31.

Olney Hymns, 160.
Ordinary of the Mass, 190 f.
Organ, 217-25.
— abuses of, 228, 231 f.
— accompaniment, 233 ff., 246 ff.

Organ, original use of, 225 ff., 231 ff.
Organum, 222.
Otto, 30.

PACE, 12.
Paraphrases, Scottish, 162.
Parker, 110.
Pattison, Pringle, 14.
Physical effect of music, 9.
Pietists, 152.
Plagal modes, 98.
Plainsong, 141 ff.
Plato, 41 f.
Playford's Psalter, 111.
Pneumatic organ, 218 f.
Poetry, music and, 37.
Popular, congregational music should be, 71 f.
Procession, 35, 87 ff.
Proper of the Mass, 190 f.
— tunes, 116 f.
Prôse, 138.
Psalms, metrical, 108 f., 110 f., 112 ff., 122 f.
Psalm tunes, 116 ff., 125, 128.
Psalter, Genevan, 112.
— in early Christian Church, 93 ff.
— Jewish, 83 ff.
Psalter, the 1564, 112 ff.
— the 1635, 116 ff.
Psalters, Scottish, 112 ff.
Purcell, 207, 239.
Puritans, 174, 237 f.

QUAVERING, 124.

RELIGIOUS significance of music, 32 f., 48 f.
Reports, tunes in, 120.
Reproduction necessary in music, 23 f.
Responsory Psalms, 94 f.
Rhythm, 11, 99, 141 f.
Rhythms, irregular, 67 f.
Richardson, Madeley, 252, 254.
Rous, 122.

SACRED music, 43.
Sang Schule, 121.
Schiller, 40.
Schopenhauer, 19, 62.
Schumann, 26, 54.
Schütz, 192.
Schweitzer, 75, 228.
Scott, Sir Walter, 123.
Secular melodies in church, 75 f.
Selborne, 138.
Sequence, 138.
Services, 200 ff.
Shaw, Martin, 167.
Smith, Father, 238.
Social character of music, 44 f., 68 f.
Socrates, 41.
Sothern, 16.
Spencer, Herbert, 13, 32.
Spiritual Songs, 113.
Spitta, 43.
Spurgeon, 237.
Sternhold and Hopkins, 108.
Subjective character of music, 18.

TALLIS, 110, 201.
Tate and Brady, 109.
Te Deum, 136, 143.
Temple music, 90 ff., 214.
Terstegen, 152.
Tertullian, 94, 218.
Toledo, Council of, 137.
Turner, 53, 61.

UNISON singing, 144, 181 ff.

VITALIANUS, 220.
Voluntaries, 255-264.

WAGNER, 20, 34.
Walker, 43, 202.
Wallace, 58.
Watts, Dr., 156, 157 f.
Wesleys, the, 159, 166.
Westminster Assembly, 114.
Whittaker, 196.
Widor, 142, 256.
Wordsworth, 11.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

81685 Lit 4744

Stewart, G.W.

Lit
4744

81685

3 APR 1928